

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 25, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE UNDERSTAND that the rules for carrying into effect the changes in the mode of hearing actions and proceedings in the High Court of Justice, under section 17 of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act are in a forward state of preparation, and it is anticipated that they will be ready for issue in the course of a few days.

IN THE CASE of *Lloyd v. Lewis*, the Court of Appeal decided last Wednesday a point of great practical importance. It is scarcely necessary to say that, according to the old practice, where a case was referred at *Nisi Prius* on the usual terms, and the arbitrator had made his award, the successful party was entitled, on production of the award, to have the finding indorsed by the officer of the court upon the *postea*, and, on the production of the *postea* so indorsed, was entitled at once to sign judgment. The indorsement of the *postea*, it should be added, always bore the date of the assizes at which the cause was set down for trial and where the nominal verdict was taken, subject to a reference; the whole of the subsequent proceedings being taken to be, as in fact they were, not proceedings in or before the court, but proceedings before an arbitrator whose jurisdiction was derived from the consent of the parties, and who was in no sense an officer of the court. In the case in question the cause had been referred at *Nisi Prius* before the Judicature Act came into operation; but the award was not made until after the Act was in force. The plaintiff, in whose favour the award was made, having had the *postea* indorsed in the usual way, signed judgment; but on an application to Field, J., at chambers, the learned judge, reversing the decision of the master, set aside the judgment, on the ground that under the new system motion for judgment was in every case necessary. This decision was upheld by Field, J., and Huddleston, B., sitting in vacation as a divisional court; but the Court of Appeal has now reversed that decision and restored the original judgment. Mellish, L.J., and Amphlett, J.A., appeared to be strongly of opinion that the case fell within the first branch of section 22 of the Judicature Act, 1873, as a proceeding which, so far as the court was concerned, had been "fully heard" before the Act came into operation; but the broader ground on which the court ultimately decided it makes the decision applicable to proceedings wholly subsequent to the Act as well as to the proceedings referred to in section 22; and it is this which gives the case its general importance. The court held that with respect to all such references the proceedings remain wholly unaffected by the Act; that ord. 40, which deals with motions for judgment, has no reference to such proceedings, which are, in fact, not proceedings under or within the Act or rules; that the "referee" mentioned in that order is an "official" or "special referee" under the Act and rules, which such a referee as this is not; and that in every such order drawn up in the

usual form by consent of the parties, it is an implied term that the successful party shall be at liberty to sign judgment upon the award, and, in the case of a reference at *Nisi Prius*, so to sign it as of the date of the nominal verdict which is taken subject to the reference.

In this decision the Court of Appeal have followed out the principle laid down in *Cruckshank v. Floating Baths Company (Limited)* (24 W. R. 644, L. R. 1 C. P. D. 260) that the old law as to reference remains unaffected by the superaddition of the new provisions of the Judicature Act, and Brett, J.A., expressly re-affirmed the position which, as a member of the Common Pleas Division, he had then laid down. It was pointed out by the court that to require a motion for judgment to be made in such cases would be to introduce a new and perfectly useless and futile step, which could be productive of nothing but delay and expense; and it is satisfactory to find that the Judicature Acts, which were intended to facilitate and expedite justice, are not open in this respect to the reproach of multiplying expense and technicality. It may be added that this was so clearly the view taken at the offices of the courts that judgments have been, since the Act, habitually signed in similar cases without any motion for judgment; and we believe that the practice was not even arrested by the decision of the divisional court in vacation. Had the Court of Appeal upheld that decision the consequences would have been as mischievous retrospectively as in the future.

THERE WILL BE FOUND reported in last week's issue of the WEEKLY REPORTER a case (*In re F. W. Snell*, 25 W. R. 40) in which it appears to us that the learned Master of the Rolls has dealt rather hard measure to a solicitor. We refer to the matter because it is one of considerable importance to the profession, and, perhaps, hardly less so to clients. There occur from time to time junctures in which an opportunity is presented of settling a pending litigation, or of obtaining important advantages for a client, in which a personal interview with some one at a distance is necessary, and in which the solicitor can trust no one but himself. It seems for the public interest that no hard-and-fast rule should be laid down restricting in these cases the discretion of the solicitor or hindering him from promptly seizing the favourable opportunity. As Lord Langdale said in *In re Pender* (10 Beav. at p. 394), "If you limit the discretion of the solicitor too much you may prevent his doing things of the greatest importance for the interest of his client." It seems to us that this will be the result of the decision in *Re Snell*.

The facts, as stated in the report, are as follows:—Mr. Snell had been generally retained as solicitor to the Flagstaff Silver Mining Company of Utah, and had also been specially retained to conduct a chancery suit brought by the company. While the suit was pending he made four journeys to Paris, the first partly on the business of the company and partly for another client; the last three exclusively for the company. During the first two journeys he opened negotiations with a defendant, which, on the second and third journeys, were continued by Mr. Snell and the chairman of the company, who accompanied him, and whose expenses were paid by the company. The taxing master allowed Mr. Snell costs at the rate of five guineas a day for the time during which he was occupied with the business of the company, and his expenses of the last three journeys. The Master of the Rolls disallowed these costs and expenses, on the ground that Mr. Snell had no special retainer to take the journeys; and the learned judge is stated to have laid it down as a general rule that where a solicitor takes journeys out of the jurisdiction he must obtain "special instructions in writing from his client."

Now we are not disposed to question the correctness of the general principle that neither a general retainer nor a

special retainer to conduct a suit authorizes a solicitor to take journeys out of the jurisdiction. It might, perhaps, be fairly urged, with reference to the recent case, that a special retainer to conduct a suit relating to the affairs of a Utah mining company contemplates acts and expenditure of a widely different kind from those which occur in an ordinary suit; that whether the act of the solicitor in taking the journeys was or was not a proper act under his retainer was a question of fact to be decided upon a consideration of the results to the client flowing from such act; that the taxing master, sitting to decide upon the facts, had found that the journeys were justified by the results; and that the court, although possessing jurisdiction to review the decision of the taxing master, should be slow to do so upon a question of this kind. We prefer, however, as we have said, to admit, both on grounds of principle and authority, that a solicitor undertaking a journey out of the jurisdiction for a client from whom he has a retainer to conduct a suit, ought to be able to prove a retainer for that purpose. But we want to know what authority there is for the proposition laid down by the Master of the Rolls that such retainer must be in writing? This was the very rule which was attempted to be laid down with reference to the retainer for the institution of a suit, and which Lord Brougham, in *Lord v. Kellett* (2 M. & K. 1), so decisively rejected. "The rule was contended for," said his lordship, "that, whenever the plaintiff denied the fact of the retainer, the solicitor was bound to produce an authority in writing, but this was not a fair inference from the language of Lord Eldon, much less was it established by the cases referred to [*Wilson v. Wilson*, 1 J. & W. 457; *Wright v. Castle*, 3 Mer. 12]. . . . The authority for filing a bill might be by parol as well as by writing, and in the former case it might be proved by circumstances, and by the subsequent conduct of the party." The same rule was laid down by Lord Langdale in *Wiggins v. Peppin* (2 Beav. at p. 405), where he says that "there may be subsequent conduct from which an acquiescence [by the client] may be inferred." Section 37, sub-section 3, of the Companies Act, 1867, seems to render this doctrine capable of application to the case of a company under the Act of 1862.

Why, then, may not the retainer to take a journey be proved by circumstances, and by the subsequent conduct of the party, in like manner as a retainer to conduct a suit? There may be more difficulty in proving subsequent conduct of such a nature as conclusively to raise the implication of a retainer in the former case than in the latter; but if ever such implication is to be raised at all, surely no circumstances can be imagined much stronger than those in *Re Snell*? The negotiations opened by Mr. Snell were adopted and ratified by the company, and the chairman, as the representative of the company, actually accompanied Mr. Snell in his two last journeys, and joined with him continuing the negotiations commenced during Mr. Snell's former visit to Paris.

THERE SEEMS TO BE GOOD GROUND for the complaint made by a correspondent with reference to the *Law Reports*. In the part for the present month (Chancery Division) there is reported a case of *Bolton v. Bolton*, which was heard on May 15 before Vice-Chancellor Hall, and was reported, only five days afterwards, in the WEEKLY REPORTER of May 20 (24 W. R. 663). The case, as our readers may remember, was that in which the learned judge held that the words in ord. 23, "thereupon he shall pay the defendant's costs of the action," were equivalent to a judgment for their recovery, on which execution might issue. In the report in the present number of the *Law Reports* an argument of counsel for the defendant is gravely given thus:—"The Rules of Court, 1875, contain no provision for signing judgment for costs to be recovered on a discontinuance."

There is no foot-note appended containing any reference to any new rule, or any warning that this is a misleading statement. Although the learned reporter and editor of the *Law Reports* do not mention it, it is nevertheless the fact that by r. 10 of the Rules of June, 1876, it was expressly provided that "a defendant may sign judgment for the costs of an action if it is wholly discontinued, or for the costs occasioned by the matter withdrawn if the action be not wholly discontinued." The result is, of course, to render the special form of writ of *fi. fa.* for which the case is apparently reported, unnecessary. The case was important when reported in the WEEKLY REPORTER a few days after it was decided, and several weeks before the new rule appeared; but now, four months after the publication of the new rule, it is absurd to report the case at all, and utterly misleading to report it without a reference to the new rule. Our correspondent draws attention to another instance of the same kind in the same number. The case of *Bacon v. Turner*, also heard before Vice-Chancellor Hall, was decided on May 3 last, and was reported in the WEEKLY REPORTER ten days afterwards—viz., on May 13 (24 W. R. 637). The decision in that case is stated in the head-note in the *Law Reports* thus:—"Where leave is given to issue a writ for service out of the jurisdiction, the words 'by leave of a court or judge,' which occur in forms 2 and 3 given in the Rules of Court, 1876, appendix A., part 1, may be omitted from the writ and notice, so as to enable the plaintiff to proceed, in default of appearance, without obtaining further leave of the court or a judge before so doing." Now, by r. 2 of the Rules of June, 1876, it is provided that "forms 2 and 3 in part 1 of appendix A. to 'the Rules of the Supreme Court' shall be read as if the words 'by leave of the court or a judge' were not there." That is to say, at least four months before the case of *Bacon v. Turner* was reported in the *Law Reports*, all possibility of the point arising on which it was decided had been removed by judicial legislation. We ask our readers to consider what would be the condition of law reporting if the profession were dependent on the so-called "authorized reports."

ONE OF THE MOST PRESSING REQUIREMENTS of the present time in regard to legal matters is a reform in the mode of conducting business at Judges' Chambers. The present state of things, as we have often pointed out, is a disgrace to our legal system. Actual physical strength is one of the first necessities for a professional man who has occasion to conduct business before a judge at chambers. He must be prepared to stand for perhaps an hour or so jammed up against a door, subjected to continual pressure from others struggling to obtain access, like himself, to the august presence of his lordship. He must maintain his position against the encroachments of fellow-victims burning with impatience, who have little scruple in anticipating him on any pretext. It is monstrous that a professional man, perhaps of some status, should have to go through what might be natural enough in the neighbourhood of the pit entrance of a theatre on Boxing-night, but is very inconvenient and unbefitting in connection with the transaction of legal business. There are, no doubt, more difficulties with regard to completely satisfactory arrangements as to the conduct of the business at Judges' Chambers than many of those who complain appear to give credit for; but some improvement might be made. There ought to be some possibility of pre-arrangement with regard to the order in which the various matters which constitute the day's business shall be taken, and this order ought to be published some time before the business commences. The kind of "first come, first served," arrangement, and the general want of organization, which prevail now, lead to fruitless waiting, waste of time, indecent confusion, and discomfort. The effectual remedy, however, as we have long urged, is the constant

presence
accomplish
in chambers
during the
at Serjeant
This would
wards and
which no
cause of
We cannot
should not

LAW
Two late
recently
days' no
presence
named the
holders
intention
"passed
the share
a meeting
proxies
"the vote
as are p
meeting
bility of
seem to
week re
ation; c
hold a
propos
for his

THE
time as
the dec
fact as
the de
Court
case of
rejecte
said th
subject
I. R.
eviden
be acc
in suc
Sir G.
the L
instan
other
non.
down
more
court

The
prelim
Satur
The
trate
Purpo
ago, w
(Mr.
the r
gentl
follow
mitt
super
justic
steps
Trans

presence of two judges at chambers. If this cannot be accomplished at present, cannot an additional judge sit in chambers at Westminster two or three days a week during the sittings, so as to clear off from the chambers at Serjeants'-inn the cases in which counsel appear? This would save the bar that agonized rushing backwards and forwards between the Temple and Westminster which now takes place, and would take away one great cause of uncertainty and delay at the other chambers. We cannot see why this very simple measure of reform should not be carried into effect.

LAW OUGHT TO BE, but is not always common sense. Two late eminent judges of the Queen's Bench Division recently held, in *Sharp v. Dawes*, that, after a seven days' notice of meeting has been properly given, the presence of a single shareholder at the time and place named therein constituted a "general meeting of shareholders" under the Stannaries Act, 1869, and that resolutions passed by the single shareholder were resolutions "passed by the votes of a majority in value of such of the shareholders as are present at the meeting." How a meeting could exist when people neither met nor sent proxies; how the vote of one shareholder could constitute "the votes of a majority in value of such of the shareholders as are present in person, or represented by proxy at the meeting"; how a majority could exist without the possibility of a minority, are questions which the learned judges seem to have put aside. The Court of Appeal has this week reversed the decision of the Queen's Bench Division; and it is no longer the law that a shareholder may hold a meeting in which he presides over himself alone, proposes puts and passes resolutions, and thanks himself for his very able services in the chair.

THE SINGULAR NOTION, on which we commented some time ago, that a court of appeal ought not to disturb the decision of a judge of first instance on a question of fact as to which he has had an opportunity of observing the demeanour of witnesses, was again pressed on the Court of Appeal at Lincoln's-inn on the 20th inst., in a case of *Bigsby v. Dickinson*, and was again unequivocally rejected by the learned judges. Lord Justice James said that he fully adhered to what had been said on this subject in the case of *The Glanibanta* (24 W. R. 1033, L. R. 1 P. D. 283). If, in every case of conflicting evidence, the decision of the court of first instance was to be accepted as final, there would practically be an end in such cases to the right of appeal. This right had, as Sir G. Bramwell said, been distinctly contemplated by the Legislature in cases in which the judge of first instance had had the witnesses before him, as well as in other cases, and due effect must be given to that provision. It has always appeared to us that the rule laid down by the Privy Council on this subject was neither more nor less than an abdication of the functions of a court of appeal.

The *Athenaeum* says that Mr. Albert Grant passed the preliminary examination for the bar last week, and on Saturday applied to be admitted as a student of Gray's-inn.

The subject of the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate for Salford was considered at a meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Salford Town Council a few days ago, when the position of affairs was explained by the ex-mayor (Mr. Alserman Harwood) and Mr. Alderman Davies; and the resolution of the magistrates having been read, the gentlemen named respectively moved and seconded the following resolution, which was carried:—"That this committee, being satisfied that the appointment of an additional stipendiary justice is expedient for the due administration of justice in this borough, recommends the council to take such steps as may be necessary under the provisions of the Salford Tramways and Improvement Act, 1875, for that purpose."

DRUNKENNESS IN ITS RELATION TO CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY.

It is a familiar maxim, which is constantly enunciated with a great assumption of sound sense and practical wisdom by chairmen of quarter sessions, that drunkenness is no excuse for crime. This sage remark, so dear to the magisterial mind, like many other legal maxims equally respectable, has the disadvantage of begging the question upon which it purports to throw light. Nobody that we know of ever suggests that drunkenness is an excuse for crime; the real question involved generally is whether there has been a crime. If you assume the crime, *cadit questio*. The material point that has to be considered with regard to intoxication is how far it may be taken into account in determining the question whether a crime has been committed, or, if so, what degree of crime. Cases in which protracted habits of drinking have so far modified the original organization as to produce insanity or mental incapacity of a prolonged character may be put aside for the present purpose. The law in these cases treats the party as if he were insane from any other cause. It is true that the original cause of his insanity was voluntary, but the connection between such voluntariness and the ultimate result is so remote that it would be manifestly impossible to treat him as subject to the ordinary responsibilities of a sane person.

Cases of this kind, therefore, being put aside, what are the rules of English law with regard to the effect of intoxication on criminal responsibility? Now, the principal cases in which this question arises are cases of larceny and cases of violent crimes, such as assaults with intent to do grievous bodily harm, and murder. In cases where the law requires an actual intent as an element in the crime it is obvious that a state of drunkenness precluding an intent (if there be such a state short of complete incapacity for doing as well as intending) will prevent the existence of the crime in question. So the question whether a man was drunk may be material in cases of larceny as bearing on the question whether there was an *animus furandi*. But in cases of murder the matter does not stand quite on the same footing, and it is not altogether easy to define the exact position which our law takes up. It is a very reasonable principle of law that a man is taken to intend the natural consequence of his own acts. Consequently, if a man attacks another man with obviously deadly weapons, that alone, without any express proof of malicious intention, is sufficient evidence of an intention to kill or do some serious mischief. But then it might be urged that drunkenness must here be material to the question of intent, as rebutting in the particular case the presumption that in ordinary cases is reasonably made. The answer that is ordinarily given by English lawyers is that, the act of getting drunk being voluntary, the drunken person cannot escape responsibility on that ground. We confess that the principle on which this is an answer, as expressed in our books, does not seem to us very clearly made out. If it is to be assumed that there is a state of intoxication in which a man is unaware of the natural consequences of his acts, the logical conclusion is that if a man in such a state commits an act to constitute which a crime intention is material, and is punished by the punishment appropriate to that crime, he is really punished for getting drunk, and not for the intentional crime. This seems absurd.

We believe the real truth to be that drunkenness is not a defence, because such drunkenness as leaves a man the capacity for acting does not take away his capacity for intending. It may lessen his self-control, it may diminish his powers of reflecting on consequences, but it does not destroy his power of willing. In this point of view it is obvious that the fact of drunkenness being voluntary becomes very material. If I voluntarily diminish my power of self-control and of reflection I am still responsible for my voluntary acts. The fact that there is a wicked mind and intention involved in

crimes of violence committed during intoxication seems to us sufficiently proved by facts of every-day experience. Men of cultivation and education sometimes get the worse for liquor, and used to do so more frequently than now, and yet how seldom it happens that the result is a murder. But the same degree of drunkenness in a class more used to violence and lawlessness will produce a crop of murders. It seems to us clear from this familiar circumstance that the act of a drunken man is an intentional act; for if there were no intention in the matter, and drunkenness generally produced an absence of capacity for intending, it would seem to follow that it would be a matter of mere chance whether the drunken scholar or the drunken costermonger more often committed a murder. We have previously expressed our opinion that the same view applies to a great many cases of madness. We do not believe that a great many mad people are incapable of intention in the sense in which the law uses the term, or destitute of the knowledge of right and wrong to the degree which our law requires to constitute a defence, but we do not believe such persons to be the proper subjects of punishment, because they have involuntarily been deprived of that ordinary degree of self-control and sound judgment to which it is expedient and just to attach criminal responsibility. The essential difference between such persons and drunken persons is that their state is in the one case involuntary and in the other voluntary. It seems to be conceivable that, if the view we have above endeavoured to set forth be correct, there may be cases where the drunken state of the accused ought logically to be material in considering the question how far the inference that he intended the natural consequence of his acts is legitimate. As long as a man is conscious that the thing he has in his hands is a knife he must be taken to intend the natural consequences of using a knife, for whatever purpose he may use it, but it is just possible that he may be in a state of drunkenness such that, on being excited, he may forget what it is he holds in his hand, and strike wildly out with it. We should doubt whether this is properly murder, but we question whether these cases really often arise. When a man passes into the more imbecile stages of drunkenness, he becomes less likely to commit crime.

In the *American Law Register* for September last there is a discussion of the American law by which murder is divided into degrees, and drunkenness may reduce what would otherwise be murder in the first degree to murder in the second degree. We do not much like this system of having degrees of crimes. To begin with, in our view the substance of the crime of murder is that it should be that crime for which the law exacts a death penalty. This may be an unphilosophical view, but we believe it to be a very sound view practically. After all, the word "murder" has no etymological signification that we can now identify, and we would preserve the traditional horror of the name to accompany only that degree of guilt which is deemed worthy of death. Another objection is, that the American system in reality is a device for throwing the *onus* of determining the degree of punishment on the jury. We doubt the propriety of this. It is not their proper function. If some sorts of murder are not worthy of being punished by death, it would be more consistent with general principles that there should be a power in the judge of pronouncing a less punishment. It might be said that this would be a great, and too painful, responsibility to cast on one individual, but practically speaking it is frequently cast upon the judge now, for in many cases the Home Secretary consults the judge as to whether the sentence shall be carried out.

The full discussion of these objections, however, does not fall naturally under the class of questions which we are now discussing. There is a strong objection which arises out of considerations peculiar to the topic we have been more particularly engaged upon. We are afraid that great risk to the community would be

involved in any system which might leave it to the jury to say whether the degree of drunkenness reduced the case to the second degree of murder. The American reviewer seems to admit that the most lamentable laxity and weakness prevail among juries in some of the States of America in this respect. He seems to think that this evil can be combated by careful descriptions and estimates of the amount of drunkenness which alone can reduce the crime to the second degree. But drunkenness is a matter of degree, and the estimate of its degree varies very much with the habits and experience of the observer. The policeman's invariable estimate of a prisoner's state with regard to liquor is, "He had had some drink, my lord, but not so much that he did not know what he was about." A sympathising "pal" will say that the same man was very drunk indeed. It is a very disagreeable thing to find a verdict involving a death penalty, and the temptation is almost irresistible to stretch a point, if possible, to avoid it. When such an elastic matter as the degree of drunkenness is made a material element, it is obvious that the result must be to open a very wide door to the most dangerous laxity on the part of juries.

CROWN PRACTICE.

As soon as the practice is settled under the Judicature Acts it will be high time that various other branches of procedure should be taken in hand. The procedure on the Crown side of the Queen's Bench Division is cumbrous, obscure, and antiquated. The law and practice on the subjects of *mandamus*, *certiorari*, *quo warranto*, and similar matters are to a great extent the creatures of unreasonable tradition handed down through successive generations of Crown Office officials. A dim and uncertain glimmer of light is afforded by Corner's Crown Practice, but it not unfrequently fails the anxious inquirer just when his path is most difficult. We cannot suggest a better or more practical rule for guidance to the bewildered, with regard to any step in Crown procedure of which they are ignorant, than to exercise their brains for the discovery of what would obviously be the most inconvenient, troublesome, and ineffective expedient that the ingenuity of man could devise as a means to an end, and when such an expedient has occurred to them, to adopt it. It is most probable that it will prove to be the proper course.

Take, for instance, the subject of *mandamus*. This is the proper means by which public bodies, officials, and others are compelled to perform public duties. One would have thought that every facility should have been given by law in the case of so beneficial a writ, and for the enforcement of such duties. But the law of *mandamus*, as it originally existed, was a monument of legal stupidity and perversity. It has been repeatedly patched, and a great deal of its original inconvenience obviated, but there are still many most absurd and unreasonable rules of law connected with it. For instance, the person seeking to have the public duty performed must specify with the most rigid accuracy in his rule exactly what the duty is that he wishes to have enforced, and the *mandamus* ultimately granted must exactly follow the rule nisi; and, again, the peremptory writ of *mandamus* must exactly follow the original writ; so that if it turns out on the proceedings, before the peremptory writ is awarded, that the prosecutor has asked for more than he is entitled to, or that he has not framed the mandatory part of his writ with the strictest accuracy, the prosecutor must fail, though it is obvious that the defendant has neglected a duty which he ought to perform, and has not been damned in any way by the prosecutor's slip.

Why, in the name of common sense, this nonsensical rigidity? The essence of all good procedure is surely that the party complaining should set out the facts, giving notice in general terms of the sort of remedy he seeks, and that the court, on the facts being laid before

them, should determine the exact form of remedy the right to which arises from such facts. Why should not the form of proceeding in *mandamus* be that the prosecutor should lay the facts before the court, and upon those facts the court should give their judgment as to what duty had been neglected and must be performed? The effect of the present rule is that the prosecutor must claim a particular judgment, and though the facts show never so clearly that he is entitled to some other form of judgment, he can have no other than one in the particular form he has claimed, and if he does not get that he must fail. This seems to us absurd. It is altogether at variance with the spirit of modern procedure, as exemplified in the changes successively introduced by the Common Law Procedure Acts and the Judicature Acts. Forms of action have been abolished. Now the plaintiff states facts, and claims what relief he may think fit, and generally such other and further relief as the nature of the case may entitle him to. The rules we have above referred to as to *mandamus* savour of the time when a man failed because he had joined *trover* and *assumpsit* in one declaration. The idea of such a state of things in an ordinary action now revolts every sensible mind. But this Crown Office practice has stood still while the world has been moving on. We have no doubt whatever that if the officials of the Crown Office were allowed to frame a new practice they could speedily produce an intelligible and reasonable one. But they are tied hand and foot by precedent, and cannot, without legislative assistance, do anything in the matter.

Some may say that very little mischief is practically produced, and that at the cost of some trouble what is wanted is effected. We do not feel sure of that. Nobody can tell who has not some experience of it how the administrative action of public bodies and departments of the State is harassed and impeded by the uncertainty and inconvenience of some of these branches of our law; and the trouble alone is worthy of consideration. Trouble means, when translated, loss of time and unnecessary labour. This, when the trouble is not really necessary, is money's worth lost.

Take another subject, that of attachment for contempt in not obeying an order of court. The only way of ascertaining whether there has been a contempt is, by the administration of written interrogatories to the accused party, which the master puts to him in private without the presence of counsel on either side. If the contempt cannot be proved out of his own mouth he may be indicted for perjury if he has sworn falsely, and can be proved to have done so, but he cannot be punished for contempt, for it would seem there is no precedent for his oral examination, or for the taking of evidence from other witnesses. What an absurdity, again, this is! Every one knows what an uncertain and ineffective expedient examination on interrogatories is, and it by no means follows in such a case that a conviction for perjury could succeed if the person swears falsely. Why should the court in its investigation into the matter of the contempt be restricted to this one mode of inquiry? We might mention other points of objection to the present Crown Office practice, but we have said enough, we think, to show the necessity for reform.

The *Daily Telegraph* says that in the case of *Stevens v. Watkinson*, before the Master of the Rolls on Friday, the 17th inst., the proprietors of the *Law List* and *Lawyer's Companion* sought to restrain the defendants from publishing a *Solicitor's Diary* in infringement of their copyright in those books. Mr. Chitty, Q.C., and Mr. Speed appeared for the plaintiffs. Mr. Davey, Q.C., and Mr. Hornell, for the defendants, submitted to an order, undertaking themselves to expunge and destroy the sheets in which the names of the country solicitors were given, and not to publish any future edition of the work with anything pirated from the *Law List*.

COUNTY COURT WORK IN 1875.

The number of plaints entered in the county courts for 1875 was 878,498, as against 865,040 in 1874. There were 653 cases sent from the superior courts, as against 655 in 1874. The total number of plaints entered from the establishment of these courts in 1847 was 20,809,807, and the aggregate amount for which they were entered was £56,932,027, and the amount for which judgment was obtained £28,642,338. In 1875 495,719 judgments were given; and the total sum for which plaints were entered was £2,847,649. The total amount of fees on all proceedings was £367,690. The causes determined in court were in the proportion of 56.4 per cent. to the plaints entered, leaving 43.6 as the proportion settled out of court. Of the judgments given 96.5 per cent. were for the plaintiff, 1.6 per cent. were nonsuits, and 1.9 per cent. were for the defendant. The number of debtors imprisoned gives one for 216.6 of the number of plaints entered, the cases from the superior courts being included. The amount for which plaints were entered in 1875 exceeds that in 1874 by £162,749, the average for each plaint being in 1875 £3 4s. 9d., and in 1874 £3 2s. 0d. The amount of costs exceeds that for 1874 by £9,943, or 15.3 per cent.; and the costs are 5.5 per cent. of the amount of debt for which judgments were obtained on original hearings. The fees in 1875 exceed those in 1874 by £17,538. The number of days of sitting for the whole of the circuits was 8,110 in 1875 and 8,028 in 1874; and in 1875 an average of 60.1 causes was daily determined. The greatest number of days of sitting on any circuit was 321 (on circuit 6, comprising Liverpool, where there are two judges); the greatest number for a single judge was 189 (on circuit 33); and the least 108, (on circuit 59). The highest average number of causes determined on each day of sitting was 150 (on circuit 14); and the lowest 26 (on circuits 28 and 32). Of the 495,719 causes determined in 1875, 1,030 were with, and 494,689 without, a jury, against 991 and 494,493 respectively in 1874. In 1875, 94,553 judgment summonses were issued, and 47,195 were heard. Warrants of commitment were issued in 23,062 cases; and 4,063 debtors were imprisoned, against 4,198 in the previous year. The number of executions issued was 176,078, and of sales made 3,690. There were 49 appeals, and 43 orders to stay proceedings.

The year 1875 was the tenth year in which the county courts have exercised equity jurisdiction. The amount of the subject-matter in dispute or otherwise before the courts in 1875 was £104,794, against £97,287 in 1874 and £91,972 in 1873. The attorney's costs allowed amounted respectively to £4,039, £5,738, and £4,355. In 1875 the fees payable to the Consolidated Fund were £982; to the registrars, £1,486; and to the high bailiffs £586. On the 31st of December 266 suits were pending; and during the year there were 5 appeals, 1 commitment for contempt, and 6 warrants of execution, possession, &c. The total equity business in the county courts during the last three years was as follows:—

	1875.	1874.	1873.
Number of Plaints entered	199	244	216
For administration of estates	32	16	16
For execution of trusts	157	82	105
For foreclosure or redemption, or for enforcing any charge or lien	92	99	112
For specific performance	5	7	8
For delivering up or cancelling any agreement for sale or purchase	53	53	44
For dissolution or winding up of partnership			

	1875.	1874.	1873.
Number of Petitions or Notices filed	17	25	22
For appointment or removal of trustees	115	78	104
For any other purpose under the Trustee Acts			

For maintenance or advancement of infants	13	16	11
For partition	18	22	19
For injunctions	21	39	24

Number of Instances of Payment by Trustees under section 24 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142	28	41	31
---	----	----	----

Total number of equitable suits or proceedings	750	722	712
--	-----	-----	-----

Another special jurisdiction conferred, is that under the County Courts Admiralty Act of 1868. In 1875, the total number of admiralty suits or proceedings was 432, against 399 in 1874. The number of arrests of vessels was 182, the number of final decrees 122; and in 67 cases the judge was assisted by assessors. The amount of claims was £47,111; the attorneys' costs allowed, £2,039; the fees to the court fund, £658; those to the registrar, £675; and those to the high bailiff, £366. There were 6 appeals, and 5 warrants of execution. The sum realized by the sale of vessels was £2,504, the costs of sales amounting to £110. There were 2 cases transferred to the High Court of Admiralty, and 1 to a county court. It is supposed that the majority of the 73 suits or proceedings given as pending, have been settled out of court. It has also been stated that in many instances the attorneys agree upon the costs and settle the cases out of court, and that consequently they are not included in the return.

In the City of London Court, which is assimilated with the county courts, but for which separate returns are made, 16,339 plaints were entered in 1875, against 14,360 in 1874 and 14,900 in 1873. There were also 39 cases from the superior courts, against 33 and 35 in the two previous years respectively. The amount of debts recovered on the hearing was £32,794 in 1875, and £25,488 in 1874; the amounts for which plaints were entered having been £84,372 and £63,156, and the costs £2,785 and £2,289, respectively. The court sat on 128 days in 1875; and the total amount of fees on all proceedings was £10,250.

Equity proceedings in the City of London Court in 1875 were 12 in number, against 10 in 1874. The amount in dispute was £2,137, and the number of suits pending at the end of the year was 3.

The total number of admiralty suits or proceedings in the City of London Court in 1875 was 214, against 300 in 1874. There were 52 arrests of vessels, 49 final decrees, and in 24 cases the judge was assisted by assessors. The amount of claims was £19,664, and the amount of attorneys' costs allowed was £1,303. The number of suits or proceedings pending was 115, and the number of appeals 6, against 7 in the previous year; and 2 cases were transferred to the High Court of Admiralty.

The *Times* reporter thus describes the proceedings at the first sitting of the House of Lords on Monday last:—At the sitting of the House this morning, at half-past ten o'clock, Lord Blackburn was introduced by Lord Hatherley and Lord O'Hagan, and Lord Gordon by Lord Clinton and Lord O'Hagan. Their lordships, who were attired in their State robes as barons, were preceded by Colonel Clifford, the Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod, and Sir A. Woods, Garter King at Arms, and they having been introduced to the Lord Chancellor, the patents conferring upon them peerages for life, with power to sit and vote so long as they should hold their office as Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, were read by the clerk at the table. Their lordships having taken the oaths, took their seats at the end of the junior barons' bench, where they were saluted in due form by the Lord Chancellor, with whom they afterwards shook hands. Their lordships then retired, and, after a short interval, re-entered the House without their robes, and took their seats as Lords of Appeal in Ordinary.

Reviews.

SMITH'S ACTION AT LAW.

SMITH'S ELEMENTARY VIEW OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN AN ACTION AT LAW. Twelfth Edition. ADAPTED TO THE PRACTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT, by W. D. I. FOULKES, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons; H. Sweet; W. Maxwell & Son.

The re-modelling which the changes in the law have necessitated in this edition seems to have been well done. Mr. Foulkes has left as much as possible of the work standing, and his additions and substitutions do not compare unfavourably in point of clearness with the old text. The statements of the new law seem to be accurate, and we think the book will keep its place as the standard introduction to the proceedings in an action in the common law divisions of the High Court.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS.

SELF-PREPARATION FOR THE FINAL EXAMINATION, &c. By JOHN INDERMAUR, Solicitor (Clifford's-inn Prizeman, Michaelmas Term, 1872). Second Edition. Stevens & Haynes.

In this edition Mr. Indermaur extends his counsels to the whole period from the intermediate examination to the final. His advice is practical and sensible, and if the course of study he recommends is intelligently followed, the articulated clerk will have laid in a store of legal knowledge more than sufficient to carry him through the final examination.

LEGAL DIARIES.

THE LAWYERS' COMPANION AND DIARY, 1877; CONTAINING A DIARY, LONDON AND PROVINCIAL LAW DIRECTORY, TABLE OF COSTS, LEGAL TIME-TABLES, &c., &c., &c. Edited by JOHN THOMPSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Thirty-first annual issue. Stevens & Sons.

Perhaps the best praise we can give to this work is that we have used the last issue constantly during the present year without, so far as we remember, discovering an inaccuracy. The present issue contains all the information which could be looked for in such a work, and gives it in a most convenient form and very completely. Thus, under the heading of Stamps, we find duly noted, not only the provisions of the Act of last session relating to policies of sea insurance, but a reference under "Lease or Tack" to the provisions of section 11 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act of last session, a section buried away in an Act relating to other matters, and most likely to escape attention. We may unhesitatingly recommend the work to our readers.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S POPULAR DIARY FOR 1877.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S OCTAVO SCRIBBLING DIARY FOR 1877.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S FOLIO SCRIBBLING DIARY FOR 1877.

These are all extremely cheap and convenient diaries, printed on good paper, and affording abundant space for entries. The foreign telegram time-table, showing the time at Greenwich when it is noon at the places specified, given in the Popular Diary, is likely to be of service to senders and receivers of such telegrams.

It is stated that Judge McAllister, of Chicago, has been requested to resign by a petition signed by 8,000 persons, the reason for the request being that he was guilty of erroneous rulings and instructions to the jury in the trial of a person accused of murder.

General Correspondence.

REPORTING.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Referring to your remarks in a late number on the growing evils of slipshod work in relation to the above, allow me to commend you to your exalted contemporary "the Authorized Reports" for this month, 3 Ch. D. 275, 276. In *Bolton v. Bolton* no reference is made to the rule of June last—ord. 23, r. 2—enabling a defendant to sign judgment in case of discontinuance, which renders all application to the court quite unnecessary. In *Bacon v. Turner* they report a case rightly reported by you within a few days of its hearing, but as to which ord. 2, r. 2, of June last now entirely does away with the necessity of any judgment whatever.

It is a heavy enough task to wade through and note absolutely necessary cases, but it really is too bad to worry our brains with cases the law of which is exploded months before they are even printed.

29, Mark-lane, E.C., Nov. 23.

T. P. Y.

Cases of the Week.

FRESH EVIDENCE ON APPEAL—COST OF PRINTING AFFIDAVITS—APPEAL ON QUESTION OF FACT—ORD. 58, RR. 5, 11.—In a case of *Bigsby v. Dickinson*, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 20th inst., fresh evidence was admitted on the hearing of the appeal under the following circumstances:—The object of the action was to restrain the defendant from causing a nuisance to the plaintiff by means of sulphuretted hydrogen gas emitted from the defendant's works. Evidence on both sides was taken *videlicet* before Vice-Chancellor Bacon. Towards the close of the defendant's case, evidence was adduced the object of which was to show that the alleged nuisance was really caused by the plaintiff's own works. It was said that in his process of manufacture of an article called Brunswick black he made use of asphalt, and that asphalt evolved sulphuretted hydrogen gas. The plaintiff desired to answer this evidence by showing that there are two kinds of asphalt, mineral asphalt and vegetable asphalt; that while the former does, the latter does not, emit sulphuretted hydrogen; and that in his manufacture he used vegetable asphalt exclusively. The Vice-Chancellor refused to admit this evidence in reply. He held that the plaintiff had attempted to deceive the court, and he dismissed his bill, with costs. The Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.) held that this evidence ought to have been admitted by the Vice-Chancellor, and they admitted it on the appeal, and, holding then that the plaintiff had completely proved his case, they granted a perpetual injunction, with the costs of the original hearing and of the appeal. The question was raised whether the plaintiff should be allowed the cost of printing the shorthand writers' notes of the evidence taken before the Vice-Chancellor. It was very voluminous, and the cost of printing it was said to amount to £300. The court said that it was a case in which it was necessary that every word of the evidence should be before them, and, while disclaiming the intention of making any precedent, they thought that in this particular case the cost of the printing should be allowed.

CONTRACT FOR SALE OF GOODS—INSOLVENCY OF PURCHASER BEFORE COMPLETION—RIGHT OF VENDOR TO REFUND.—The question which was brought before the Court of Appeal in *Ex parte Chalmers* (21 W. R. 349, L. R. 8 Ch. 289), and before the Court of Common Pleas in *Bloomer v. Bernstein* (23 W. R. 238, L. R. 9 C. P. 588) and *Morgan v. Bain* (23 W. R. 239, L. R. 10 C. P. 15), again received a full discussion before the Court of Appeal on the 22nd inst., in a case of *Re The Phoenix Bessemer Steel Company*, viz., under what circumstances is a vendor who has entered into a contract for the sale of goods which he is to deliver to the purchaser, either in one lot or by successive instalments, upon the terms of receiving payment, either in bills or in

cash, at a specified date after delivery, entitled afterwards to refuse to deliver in pursuance of his contract unless the purchaser will pay cash upon delivery? In *Ex parte Chalmers*, Mellish, L.J., said that, when a purchaser of goods becomes insolvent before the contract for sale has been completely performed, the seller, notwithstanding that he may have agreed to allow credit for the goods, is not bound to deliver any more goods under the contract until the price of the goods not yet delivered is tendered to him, and in that case it was held that, where a trader had called his creditors together and informed them that he was insolvent, a person who had contracted to sell goods to him, the delivery of which was not completed, was entitled to rescind the contract. And this was followed in *Morgan v. Bain* and in *Bloomer v. Bernstein*. In *Re The Phoenix Bessemer Company*, the Carnforth Company had, in October, 1874, contracted to deliver to the Phoenix Company 2,500 tons of pig iron by equal monthly deliveries, spread over ten months, and payment was to be made by four months' bills, or in cash, less two and a half per cent. discount, on the 10th day of the month following each delivery. Under this contract deliveries were made in November and December, 1874, and in January and February, 1875. On the 24th of February the Phoenix Company called a meeting of their principal creditors, and informed them that the company had not sufficient capital for the extent of the business which they were carrying on, and that, unless they could succeed in raising additional capital, they should be obliged to discontinue their business, and they asked the creditors to give them an extension of time to meet their engagements, so that they might summon a meeting of the shareholders to consider the question of raising further capital. The Carnforth Company were present at this meeting. The shareholders afterwards met and resolved to raise additional capital by means of subscriptions for unissued shares, and a large part of what was required was soon subscribed for. The company had also works and plant of considerable value. They continued to carry on their business as a going concern until the end of May, when, in consequence of the failure of a firm whose acceptances they held to a large amount, the company were compelled to resolve upon a voluntary winding up. The Carnforth Company had made no deliveries under their contract since the 24th of February, and on the 23rd of April the Phoenix Company had given notice to cancel the contract. The Carnforth Company claimed to prove in the liquidation for damages for the cancellation of the contract, the market price of iron having meanwhile fallen considerably below the contract price, and it was contended on their behalf that the effect of what took place at the meeting of the 24th of February was that the Phoenix Company had then declared themselves practically insolvent, and unable to meet their engagements, and that consequently, according to *Ex parte Chalmers*, the Carnforth Company were thereupon entitled to refuse to make any further deliveries of iron, except upon the terms of being paid cash upon delivery. The Master of the Rolls refused to admit the claim, holding that nothing had been done at the meeting of the 24th of February which amounted to a declaration of insolvency within the meaning of *Ex parte Chalmers*, and this decision was, after a lengthened argument, sustained by the Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.). They said that to excuse the vendor in such a case from fulfilling his contract there must have been, on the part of the purchaser, an open and avowed insolvency, a declaration, in effect, that he was unable to meet his engagements, and did not intend to do so; whereas in the case before the court there was nothing to show that the company were insolvent on the 24th of February, and they had asked their creditors to give them time only for the purpose, and with the intention, of meeting their engagements, and had, in fact, for several months after carried on their business as a going concern, discharging their liabilities as they became due. To such a state of circumstances the rule laid down in *Ex parte Chalmers* certainly did not apply.

FRIVOLOUS APPEAL BY TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY—COSTS—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, r. 188.—The Court of Appeal have, on several recent occasions, expressed in strong terms their disapprobation of the way in which the most frivolous appeals are often brought by trustees in bankruptcy upon

the expectation that in any event the costs will be allowed out of the bankrupt's estate. On the 23rd inst., in a case of *Re East*, the trustee in a bankruptcy brought an appeal from a decision of the Chief Judge upon a question of fact, the question being whether a proof tendered against the estate ought to be rejected, on the ground that the person who tendered it had been in partnership with the bankrupt, and could not therefore be permitted to prove in competition with the creditors. Both the county court judge and the Chief Judge had held that there was no evidence of the alleged partnership. The Court of Appeal (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.) took the same view of the evidence, and, without calling on the respondent, dismissed the appeal, with costs to be paid by the trustee, characterizing the appeal as a merely idle one. James, L.J., expressed a hope that the trustee would not be allowed his costs out of the estate, and desired that the opinion of the Court of Appeal might be communicated to the county court judge. His lordship said that the court were shocked to see what frivolous appeals are constantly brought by trustees in bankruptcy, the estate of a bankrupt being treated as if it were a mere carcass to be devoured by every vulture. It was suggested by the counsel for the trustee that he had acted under the direction of the committee of inspection. And the respondent's counsel then attempted to induce the court to make an immediate order that either the solicitor or the committee of inspection should pay the costs of the appeal, and that they should not be paid out of the estate, contending that the court had jurisdiction to do this under r. 188, which says that "All costs shall be in the discretion of the court, and shall be paid by such persons as the court shall order." The court, however, held that they could not make an order for the payment of costs by any person who was not before them. All they could do was to make a personal order against the trustee, leaving it to the county court judge to say whether he should be recompensed out of the bankrupt's estate.

APPEAL FROM INTERLOCUTORY ORDER—EXTENDING TIME—ORD. 58, r. 15.—On the 23rd inst., in a case of *Cross v. Barber*, Byrne applied *ex parte* to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal from an interlocutory order made by Field, J., as vacation judge, notwithstanding the expiration of the three weeks limited by ord. 58, r. 15, for appealing. Byrne said that the order was for payment of a sum of £2,000 and costs, and that, though interlocutory in form, it was in truth in its nature final. It was doubtful, therefore, whether any extension of time was really required; whether, in fact, there was not a right of appeal at any time within a year. But it was thought more prudent to make the application. The court (James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.) acceded to the application, subject to any objection which might be raised by the respondents on the hearing of the appeal.

MEETING OF COST-BOOK COMPANY UNDER STANNARIES ACT.—The Court of Appeal (Lord Coleridge, C.J., Mellish, L.J., and Brett and Amphlett, J.J.A.) had a curious question raised before them on the 21st inst., in the case of *Sharp v. Davies*, as to the validity of resolutions passed at a general meeting of shareholders of a company where only one shareholder was present. The company was worked on the "cost-book" principle, under the Stannaries Act, 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 19), and the meeting in question had been admittedly duly convened by the seven days' notice required by the Act, but only one shareholder attended. He voted himself into the chair, audited and passed the accounts of the company, made a call, which the defendant as one of the shareholders refused to pay, and which was the subject of the action, and "the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman." The court below held, on motion for judgment, that, since the meeting had been duly convened, and the Act requires no quorum to render the meeting valid, the resolutions were good, having been passed as required by section 4 of the Act by a "majority in value of such of the shareholders as are present at the meeting." The Court of Appeal reversed this decision on the authority of the strict definition in the dictionaries of the word "meeting," and held that there had been no meeting of shareholders within the Act.

EQUITY TO SETTLEMENT—HUSBAND'S MORTGAGES—CHILDREN OF FORMER MARRIAGE.—A question as to a married woman's equity to a settlement as against the husband's mortgages came before Vice-Chancellor Hall on the 22nd inst., in *Conington v. Gilliat*. The amount in question was about £3,000, and it was stated that the income of that sum, together with the lady's other property would not amount to more than £300 a year. The lady was living apart from her husband, who had become bankrupt, and had contributed nothing towards her maintenance since the separation. Before the separation the parties had lived at the rate of about £500 a year. No settlement except of plate and furniture had been made on the marriage, and it was stated that out of about £11,000 to which the wife had become entitled at various times, the husband had received about £3,000. *Hastings, Q.C.*, and *Hadley*, for the plaintiff, submitted that the whole fund ought to be settled upon the lady and her two children by a former marriage. *W. Pearson, Q.C.*, and *Lewin*, for the mortgagees, contended that only half, or at most three-fourths, of the fund should be settled, and that the children (who were otherwise provided for) should not take any interest under the settlement. *C. Howard* and *Aspinall*, for other parties. The Vice-Chancellor held that the whole fund must be settled on the wife and children.

TRANSFER OF ACTION.—In the case of *Holmes v. Harvey*, before Cleasby and Huddleston, BB., on Tuesday last, a motion was made by way of appeal from a decision of Lopes, J., at chambers. The action was brought in March last in the Exchequer Division for the breach of an agreement and also for fraudulent misrepresentation of the value of a business. In May, a cross-suit was instituted in the Chancery Division by the defendant in the present action against the plaintiff for specific performance of the agreement. After issue had been joined in both the actions the defendant in that in the Exchequer Division made an application at Judges' Chambers, under ord. 51, r. 2, for an order for the transfer of the action to the Chancery Division and its consolidation with the cross-suit instituted in that division. Lopes, J., refused to grant such order, on the ground that the case was one which would be best tried by a jury. From this decision the defendant now appealed, and the court held that, inasmuch as the question of specific performance of a contract (which by section 34 of the Judicature Act, 1873, is specially assigned to the Chancery Division) was one of the points at issue between the parties, the order should be granted, and that the fact that some of the matters in dispute might be more satisfactorily dealt with by a jury was not a sufficient ground for refusing the application. Huddleston, B., further remarked that it was not clear that a judge of the Chancery Division might not try a case with a jury if it was deemed necessary, and that, at all events under ord. 36, r. 29 he might direct that any particular issue in the case might be tried by a jury if he thought it advisable to do so.

DEBTOR'S SUMMONS—STAYING PROCEEDINGS—SECURITY—BILL OF EXCHANGE—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 7.—In a case of *Re Latham*, heard by the Chief Judge on the 20th inst., the question arose whether, upon an application to dismiss a debtor's summons, the registrar had been right in making an order staying the proceedings upon the terms of the summoned debtor paying into court the amount of the debt claimed, together with a sum by way of security for costs. The debt claimed arose upon a bill of exchange accepted in the name of a firm, and of which the summoning creditor alleged that he was the holder for value. The creditor had, before he issued the summons, commenced an action in the Exchequer Division against the firm upon the bill, and in that action the defendants had, under the Bills of Exchange Act of 1865, obtained leave from a judge to defend the action without giving any security. The defendants had pleaded that the plaintiff had given no consideration for the bill, and they also alleged that he had taken it with notice that it was a mere accommodation bill, and that it was signed by one of the partners in the accepting firm without the knowledge and in fraud of his partner. The Chief Judge

held that, in the exercise of the discretionary power given by the Bankruptcy Act to require security upon staying the proceedings on the summons, regard ought to be had to the fact that in the action the judge had not thought it necessary to require the defendants to give security as a condition of their being allowed to defend the action. Upon this ground the Chief Judge decided that no security ought to have been required by the registrar. In connection with this decision reference may be usefully made to the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Ex parte Lowenthal*, 22 W. R. 459, L. R. 9 Ch. 324, 329, and *Ex parte Turner*, L. R. 10 Ch. 175.

MISDESCRIPTION IN DEED.—LATENT AMBIGUITY.—PAROL EVIDENCE TO EXPLAIN.—In another case of *Re Boulter*, heard by the Chief Judge the same day, a builder, who was possessed of a number of leasehold houses under different leases, all of which he had mortgaged to a building society, gave to his bankers, to secure the balance from time to time due from him to them, a deed of charge upon the premises mentioned in the schedule to the deed, subject to a prior mortgage of the 3rd of October to the building society. In the schedule to the deed of charge, the premises were described as three leasehold houses comprised in a lease of the 25th of September granted to the mortgagor by one Lewis. As a matter of fact, the lease of the 25th of September comprised only one house, and that one house was also alone comprised in the mortgage of the 3rd of October. The mortgagor afterwards became bankrupt, and the bank claimed to be entitled to a charge upon two houses, which were comprised in a lease to the bankrupt dated the 31st of December, and which had been mortgaged to the building society by a deed dated the 14th of January. The manager of the bank and the bankrupt both gave evidence that, before the deed of charge in favour of the bank had been executed, the bank had required satisfactory security before consenting to make further advances to the bankrupt, and thereupon he had offered them security upon three houses, two of which were, in fact, comprised in the lease of the 31st of December, and he had gone with the manager and had pointed out to him those two houses, as well as the third, after which the manager had agreed to accept the three houses as security for further advances. The bankrupt then went back with the manager to the bank, where the deed of charge was drawn up and executed, the description of the property in the schedule being inserted in accordance with the bankrupt's instructions. The county court judge held that, the description in the schedule being on the face of it perfectly clear and unambiguous, parol evidence could not be admitted to show that the parties to the deed intended something different from that which they had said. The Chief Judge was of opinion that a good verbal contract to give a charge on the three houses had been proved, and held that the bank were entitled to a charge on the two houses comprised in the lease of the 31st of December.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, says the *Times*, having received a representation from certain parishioners of All Saints, Clifton, made in purpose of the provisions of the Public Worship Regulation Act, complaining of Ritualistic practices on the part of the Rev. R. W. Randall, Vicar of All Saints, and having considered the whole circumstances attending such representation, has come to the conclusion that proceedings should not be taken thereon. The right rev. prelate gives as reasons for the conclusions at which he has arrived that the matters complained of in the representation are similar to those contained in the analogous case of *Clifton v. Randall*, which is set down for hearing before the Judicial Committee, and if such appeal should be withdrawn it will be in the power of the complainants at once to make another representation. His lordship also states that, to avoid all unnecessary litigation, it is desirable that judgment should be delivered in the Folkestone appeal before any further proceedings are taken in a strictly analogous case, the more so as it has been publicly stated by the highest legal authority in the kingdom that the two decisions (barring upon such case) of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council "cannot be regarded as final."

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society on Tuesday last, held at the Law Institution (Mr. Fell, B.A., in the chair), the question discussed was as follows:—"Is a shipowner, not being a common carrier who carries goods on board his vessel for hire, in the absence of express stipulation to the contrary, subject to the liability of an insurer except as against the act of God or of the Queen's enemies?" The subject was stated to be one without any definite authority on either side, but on the part of the affirmative the *extra-judicial* remarks of Mr. Justice Brett in *Nugent v. Smith* (24 W. R. 237, L. R. 1 C. P. D. 19) were relied on, and on the part of the negative the dissension of the Lord Chief Justice in the same case on appeal L. R. 1 C. P. D. 433). The debate was opened in the affirmative by Mr. Hargreaves, and in the negative by Mr. Indermaur (for Mr. Gane), and was ultimately decided in the negative by a majority of four votes. Twenty members were present.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday evening last, the 22nd inst. Mr. Dowson opened the subject for the evening's debate, viz., "That there is not sufficient evidence to justify a belief in ghosts or spiritualism." The motion gave rise to an animated discussion, and was in the end carried by a majority of nine. Thirty members were present.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT, LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The last meeting of this society was held at the Athenaeum, Plymouth, on Friday, the 17th inst. (James Lye, Esq., in the chair). After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, Mr. Brown proposed that a special meeting of the society be held on Friday, the 24th inst., to consider the proposed new rules which would then be submitted by the revision committee, and the motion was carried unanimously. The subject for discussion, "That persons accused of crimes should be allowed to give evidence on their trial," was then brought forward, Messrs. C. Matthews and P. B. Pugh speaking in support and Messrs. M. Harrison and C. France opposing. Messrs. Adams, Guy, Benson, Fox, and Helpman afterwards joined in the discussion, which was carried on to a late hour. On the summing up of the chairman the question was put to the vote and decided in the affirmative by a majority of three.

LEEDS INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this society was recently held at the offices of the hon. secretary.

The report of the committee was read, which stated that the number of members was fifty-eight, and that rooms had been engaged for the library, and directions had been given for binding and repairing all the reports and text-books, and putting the library, consisting of about 1,300 volumes, in good condition, at an estimated cost of about £90. The report also contained the following remarks:—

Preliminary Examination.—Applications are not infrequently made to members of the profession to sign memorials for the exemption of solicitors' clerks and others from the preliminary examination under the 3th section of the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127. Such memorials are sometimes signed by members of the society against their better judgment from motives of kindness, or because the application is concurred in by others. Your committee consider that the possession of general knowledge is so important in a liberal profession that the examination in question should not, except in very special cases, be dispensed with, and that it would relieve members of the society from the responsibility of acceding to or refusing such applications, if it were a rule with members not to sign any such memorial unless it had been first submitted to and approved by the General Committee of the society.

Conditions on Fire Policies as to Contribution.—At the general meeting of the Associated Provincial Law Societies held on the 31st of March last, the following resolution

was passed:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting, the condition lately inserted in policies of fire insurance, that in case the property, the subject of the insurance, is insured by the insurer or any other person whomsoever, the office shall only be liable to pay a proportionate part of the loss, is unreasonable and unfair, and that the attention of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and of the country law societies, be called to this subject."

The condition in question, which is found in all policies issued by offices belonging to the Association of Fire Insurance Offices, has only been inserted during the last four or five years, and is as follows:—

"If at the time of any loss or damage by fire happening to any property hereby insured there be any other subsisting insurance or insurances, whether effected by the insured or by any other person, covering the same property, the society shall not be liable to pay or contribute more than its rateable proportion of such loss or damage."

This condition prejudicially affects mortgagees and others insuring property for their security. Property may be insured by mortgagees for the amount of their advance and premiums paid by them to the office of their selection, in the belief that they will recover the amount insured in case of a total loss. But on the loss happening it may turn out that the property has been insured by second mortgagees or others, without their knowledge, in another office, and that they are therefore entitled to obtain from their own insurers a part only of the sum insured, for the whole of which they have paid premiums. And in the case of the second office being unable or unwilling to pay, great hardship is inflicted, for no notice of the subsequent insurance is required to be given to the first insurers. There are difficulties in the way of dealing satisfactorily with the case of double insurances, and at present your committee must content themselves with bringing the matter under the notice of the society, as requested by the resolution above set forth.

The Associated Provincial Law Societies have this year been instrumental in bringing about an important alteration in the rules and orders of the Supreme Court of Judicature. At the general meeting of the members of that Association, held in London on the 30th of March last, attention was called to the restrictions placed upon the working of the district registries by the construction put by some judges of the Chancery Division upon ord. 35, r. 1. The result of the decisions was that, while the district registrar was enabled to make an order for an account where the writ of summons is indorsed with a claim for account under ord. 3, r. 8, and the plaintiff is entitled to an order by reason of defendant's default of appearance under ord. 16, r. 1, yet if the defendant should appear and consent to the order, the district registrar had no jurisdiction. An amendment of ord. 35, r. 1, with the object of curing this defect, was suggested to the Lord Chancellor and the judges, on behalf of the Association, in April last, to which effect was given by the 12th rule of the Supreme Court, June, 1876. A suggestion made at the same time to extend the jurisdiction of district registries to all proceedings in the Chancery Division, or which can be taken on an originating summons before the chief clerk up to and including final judgment, and all accounts and proceedings consequent upon a judgment, or an order on further directions, did not meet with success. Your committee, however, consider that the subject should not be allowed to drop. The power of carrying through chancery proceedings in chambers before local tribunals is one of the principal objects which the law societies have always had in view, and there appears to be now no reason why the power should not be conferred.

Parliamentary Agents.—On the publication of the report of the joint select committee of the two Houses of Parliament on this subject on the 21st of July last, your committee carefully examined the proposals which it contained. They were found to amount to this:—That, for the future (with only a partial saving of existing rights), the profession of parliamentary agent was to be open to any one who passed an examination in general knowledge by the Civil Service Commissioners, and an examination on parliamentary practice before an unnamed body of examiners, barristers, solicitors, and graduates of any university of the United Kingdom were exempt from the examination in general knowledge, but might present themselves as candidates for the special examination. The candidate who had passed the special examination had further to apply to the

Chairman of Committees and the Speaker to have his name entered on the roll; and if those functionaries were satisfied that the candidate was in all respects a fit and proper person to be appointed a parliamentary agent, his name would be entered on the roll.

Any agent may be struck off the roll by the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker for neglect of rules or professional misconduct of any kind.

One of the rules, the infraction of which is to be visited by this severe penalty, is that no division of the charges of a parliamentary agent is to be made. And inasmuch as the taxing officer of either House is expressly instructed to report to the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker the bill of costs of any agent which he may deem to contain improper or exorbitant charges, it appears probable that the insertion of charges which a taxing master deemed improper, would also be a breach of rule, which would render an agent liable to be struck off the roll.

This mode of dealing with the subject seemed to your committee in the highest degree impolitic and unfair. No security whatever was taken for the possession by the agent of legal knowledge, although the joint select committee expressed the opinion that an accurate acquaintance with particular branches of law was necessary to him. So long as the entrance to the general profession of the law is guarded by tests of legal fitness, and subject to taxes, there seems no reason why the entrance to this particular branch of the profession should be untaxed and unsecured against legal incompetence. If an agent in any other court of law may without objection share a portion of his profits with those who bring him the business, it is difficult to see why division of profits in the High Court of Parliament should be an offence meriting immediate and ignominious dismissal from practice. Your committee accordingly, on the 19th of July, passed the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this society it is not advisable to impose any restrictions upon the practice of parliamentary agents dividing their charges with the country solicitors who instruct them, and that such prohibition would not lessen the present costs of parliamentary procedure."

"That in the opinion of this society it is advisable to confine the appointment of parliamentary agents to solicitors of the Supreme Court."

A deputation from the Liverpool, Leeds, Bolton, and Wakefield Law Societies, accompanied by some members of Parliament, and other persons of influence, attended Mr. Raikes, the Chairman of Committees of the House of Commons, on the 27th of July, in support of these resolutions, which had been concurred in by the leading law societies. In the result, the report of the joint select committee was adopted by the House of Lords, but no resolution upon it was come to by the House of Commons. The subject will be brought before Parliament early next session, and your committee advise a formal expression of the opinion of the society upon it, and a request to the local members to support such opinion. A resolution embodying the resolution passed by your committee will be accordingly moved at the annual meeting.

Stamping Executed Deeds.—Application has lately been made to the Board of Inland Revenue to allow executed deeds to be transmitted from the Leeds Inland Revenue Office to London to be stamped, as is done in the case of agreements. No reply has yet been received to this application.

The report having been read, it was proposed by the CHAIRMAN, seconded by Mr. LATIMER, and

Resolved,—"That the report, as printed, be received."

It was proposed by Mr. H. J. CARR, seconded by Mr. J. NORTH, and

Resolved,—"That in the case of new members of the society, this meeting hereby authorizes the committee to receive the present entrance and library fee by payments extending over two years."

The CHAIRMAN then moved, and Mr. RIDER seconded, the adoption of the report, which was agreed to.

The following gentlemen were then elected members of the committee for the ensuing year, in place of the retiring committee men:—Messrs. F. H. BARR, J. LATIMER, G. H. NELSON, and E. WILSON.

The treasurer's accounts for the year having been presented—

It was proposed by the CHAIRMAN, seconded by Mr. SIMPSON, and

Resolved,—“That the treasurer's accounts as presented, be received.”

Mr. T. Marshall was re-elected secretary for the year.

Mr. J. D. Kay was re-elected treasurer for the year.

Mr. Williams James Cousins was elected a member of the society.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, and Mr. H. J. CARR seconded, the following resolution, of which notice had been duly given, and it was accordingly

Resolved,—“That it is undesirable for members of the society to sign any memorial for dispensing with the preliminary examination in general knowledge, under the 8th section of the Attorneys Act (23 & 24 Vict. c. 127), or any part of such examination, unless such memorial be first submitted to and approved of by the committee.”

Mr. H. APPLETON called the attention of the society to a condition lately inserted into conditions of sale of real estate by auction in the borough, and which was in the following terms:—

“Upon payment of the remainder of the purchase-money of any lot at the time above mentioned, a conveyance of the said lot shall be executed by the vendors, and all others proper and necessary parties (if any). If the vendors require a duplicate of the said conveyance, such duplicate will be prepared by their solicitor, and the purchaser shall execute the same free of expense to the vendors, and shall lend their solicitor the original deed, duly executed, for the purpose of getting the duplicate denoted. A form of conveyance, embodying provisions intended to meet the special conditions as to streets and drains, has been prepared, copies thereof will be produced in the sale-room, and a copy will be furnished gratis to each purchaser on application, and the conveyance of each lot shall, except where the vendors shall consent to any variation in the frame thereof, be taken in such form, or as near thereto as circumstances will admit; save, as aforesaid, all costs, charges, and expenses of and attending the investigation and proof of title, production of deeds, the preparation, approval, and execution of the conveyance and the completion of the purchase, shall be borne and paid by the purchaser.”

Mr. APPLETON stated that under this condition the vendor's solicitor claimed, and was paid by the purchaser, all the costs of the vendor's solicitor, from and including the letter with abstract of title, up to and including the attendance on completion.

It was then moved by Mr. APPLETON, seconded by Mr. SIMPSON, and

Resolved,—“That the condition in question is unjustifiable and unprofessional.”

It was also, on the motion of Mr. G. H. NELSON, seconded by Mr. SNOWDON,

Resolved,—“That a copy of the last resolution be sent to the solicitor whose name appears upon the conditions of sale and to the secretary of the Incorporated Law Society.”

Mr. MARSHALL then moved, and Mr. J. NORTH seconded, the following resolution, which was adopted:—

“That in the opinion of this society it is not advisable to impose any restrictions upon the practice of parliamentary agents dividing their charges with the country solicitors who instruct them, and that such prohibition would not lessen the present costs of parliamentary procedure.

“That in the opinion of this society it is advisable to confine the appointment of parliamentary agents to solicitors of the Supreme Court.”

A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the business of the meeting.

BRADFORD LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The annual dinner in connection with the Bradford Law Students' Society was held on Monday evening at Leuchter's Restaurant. Mr. W. T. S. Daniel, Q.C., the president of the society, occupied the chair, and among others present were Mr. Wheelhouse, M.P., Mr. Serjeant Tindal Atkinson, Mr. George Robinson (the registrar of the Bradford County Court), Mr. W. T. McGowen (town clerk), Alderman Terry, Mr. H. F. Killick, Mr. S. Robinson, Mr. W. Groves, and Mr. J. G. Hutchinson. At the conclusion of the repeat the usual loyal toasts were given from the chair and duly responded to.

The PRESIDENT next gave “Our Profession,” and said that he would revert for a few moments to the position of the profession at the present time. He had himself probably been a member of the profession longer than any man in the room; he was entering on the fifty-third year since he had become an articled clerk. He began on the lowest steps of the ladder, and though he had not mounted very high, it had always been his ambition to stand steady and firm on every step that he took, not caring about a rapid flight upwards so much as being quite sure and firm where he was. It had always been his fond desire—some people might call it a Quixotic notion—that the profession should be made of such a character that all its practitioners should become objects, not only of respect, but of confidence, that it should not be thought a singular and an extraordinary thing that a man should have as his epitaph, “Here lies an honest lawyer,” but that the profession should be so conducted from the highest to the lowest that, making all allowance for conventional distinctions between the highest judge and the humblest practitioner, the same feeling of respect should be felt by all who came within the power of the one or the influence of the other. He believed such a state of things was capable of being realized. If it could be realized by one individual there was no limit to the number of individuals by whom it might be realized, and as the character of the bulk depended on the character of the individual grains of which it was composed, if each individual was good the bulk must be good, too. He said then, to his younger friends who were present, and whose interests they were met more particularly to serve, that the profession was now, as it were, in a transition state in this respect, that the almost offensive social distinctions which existed between the one branch and the other were dying away, and the difference in social status between the one and the other had almost, if not entirely, ceased. Even in London—the centre of prejudice and obstinate adherence to that which was old, whether it was valuable or not—these distinctions had to a great extent given way. He would recommend his young friends, without relaxing to any extent in their diligence in the discharge of their special duties at the present, to look onwards and upwards. The late meeting of the Incorporated Law Society at Oxford suggested views to the articled clerks throughout the country which they ought well to consider, and, if they could, to take advantage of by combining with the study of the practical part of their profession the cultivation of a more liberal education. Don't let them think of confining themselves to books of practice or to treatises on law; let them make themselves familiar with science in its various forms. He supported the suggestion that had been made that the term of five years should be shortened to three in favour of students who could pass proper examinations at Oxford or Cambridge. It was by improving themselves in those branches of knowledge which were distinct from the practice of their profession that the younger members could prepare themselves for obtaining equality in social position with the members of the bar. He had no wish to suggest the notion that there should be no distinction; but his notion was that the distinction should be simply that which arose from the difference between advocacy and agency, and that facilities should be given by the Inns of Court, who had the power of calling persons to the bar, and by the regulations of the Incorporated Law Society, who had the privilege of granting certificates of fitness for admission to the roll of solicitors—that facilities should be given of such a character on both sides that if young men desired to become members of the bar, and when they had attained to that position, found that circumstances caused them to desire not to degrade themselves or to go lower, but to step from the one branch of the profession to the other, the means of transition should be easy. So, on the other hand, he desired to see that if a man became a solicitor, and he found that he had powers within him which would enable him to take the branch of advocacy in preference to that of agency, greater facilities than now existed should be provided for the passage from the one branch to the other. The regulations were at present such that very few men would undergo the disadvantages. Instances had occasionally occurred, as that of Mr. Field, formerly the junior partner in a firm of solicitors in London, and that of Mr. Manisty, who was

articled in Newcastle, and who also afterwards became a junior member of a firm of solicitors in London, which showed that sometimes men were able to rise from the one branch of the profession to the highest positions in the other. He very little doubted, if the transition was rendered more easy, that a greater number of such cases would occur, because he did not hesitate to say that a solicitor's office, where the business was conducted by men of experience, men of principle, and men of honour, was the very best school in which a man could begin, for the purpose of qualifying himself to attain to the very highest position at the bar.

Mr. J. T. LAST, in proposing the toast of "The President," said that the success of a society such as theirs depended in a large measure on the support it received from gentlemen of position in the profession. In this respect the Bradford Law Students' Society was greatly favoured in having their respected county court judge as its president. The society in a great degree owed its success to his presidency and support; he was always ready to assist the members of the society in every way in his power, and the members of the society were proud to have such a gentleman at their head.

The toast having been drunk with musical honours and "three times three,"

The PRESIDENT, in responding, asked whether, if it should fall to his lot on the following day to hear a case in which some of those present should think his decision was wrong, and that he had been very obstinate and determined to have his own way, he would be "a jolly good fellow" then? Apart from all joking, however, he did not think that he had done anything beyond what was necessarily involved in that which he had undertaken when they had conferred on him the distinction of being the president of their society. They would allow him to say, however, that the one object of his ambition had been to try to satisfy the public and the profession within the area in which he lived that it was possible for a judge to reside amongst those who were subject to his jurisdiction, and yet to retain their respect. One of the great objections urged by people who lived in the narrow sphere of London—for London, notwithstanding its numbers, was really a little place, where opinion moved in certain small grooves and circles—was that justice could not be administered in the manner in which it ought to be administered by a judge living in the midst of those who were subject to his jurisdiction; that he must get prejudices; that there would be sure to be some influence exercised by gentlemen whose hospitality he enjoyed; and that it was impossible for a judge of an inferior court to have the proper status with the profession. In London he knew that this was the notion, and when he went up to London twice a year to take his seat at Lincoln's-inn, he could not help feeling that there was a want of respect, because it was thought that he had stepped down by accepting the position which he held. That was not his notion; he thought it had been a step upwards. He felt that if a man did his duty in that position, with all the disadvantages of a want of social position and a supposed professional degradation, that he was rising in his profession and not falling. He believed that it was possible for a man to do his duty, and he owed a debt to those who had enabled him to feel that he was able to live among them, and to decide against them; to receive their hospitality and to be one of them, and yet in his seat of judgment to have respect paid to him.

Mr. HIRD proposed "The Vice-Presidents," which was acknowledged by Mr. W. T. MCGOWAN, who congratulated their president on his having been removed from the "little sphere" of London to a district where his usefulness was far greater than it could have been if he had been appointed to a far higher position in the metropolis. Speaking to the younger members of the profession who were present, he reminded them that, though their profession was not a profitable one, it was an honourable one; and one thing they could be sure of, that they never need have an idle hour on their hands, because there was not a man living who knew the law of England from beginning to end.

The SECRETARY (Mr. J. R. HOLMES) read the report of the society for the past session, which stated that the list of members of 1876 comprised two more names than did that of 1875, the numbers for those years being eighty-four and eighty-two respectively, of whom fifty-nine were honorary members and twenty-five ordinary members. Eighteen meetings had been held during the past season, at which nine legal and seven jurisprudential or

social questions had been debated, and several motions passed in connection with the constitution of the society. The average attendance at each meeting had been fifteen, and the average number of speakers at each meeting, six. The lively interest shown by the honorary members in the society was evidenced by the fact that twelve of the above meetings had been presided over by honorary members, who, whilst their presence had been very encouraging to the students, thus showing an appreciation of the labours of the latter, had also materially assisted them in acquiring an accurate knowledge of the law, and helped them in rightly deciding the several matters under discussion. The late session concluded with the trial of an imaginary action at *Nisi Prius*, for breach of contract, before Mr. J. H. WADE, as judge, and a special jury, consisting of the members present on the occasion and not otherwise engaged in the case. This trial was looked forward to with much interest by the society, and brought together the largest meeting of the season. It was as successful as any innovation can expect to be, and the committee suggested that it should be made the annual ending of each session. There were at present fifteen works in the library, mostly text books and guides. Since the opening of the library in November last, there had been seventy issues of books. Taking into consideration that there were only fifteen works in the library, it might be said that it had been very extensively used, and if enlarged would doubtless add to the success of the society. The committee had to thank Mr. T. SPINK for his generous offer to lend books to the society. The committee had pleasure in reporting that the finances were in a flourishing condition. The expenditure had been £50 3s. 7½d., and the receipts £53 1s. 6d., thus making, with the surplus of last year, a balance of £62 1s. 10d. In conclusion, the committee trusted that the society might continue to deserve the support, both pecuniary and otherwise, which had been so lavishly bestowed upon it; and that the ordinary members would take care to lay hold of every opportunity for advancement in knowledge which the society held out to them.

Other toasts followed. The PRESIDENT gave "The Society," which was responded to in an effective and humorous speech by Mr. F. BROUGHTON. "The Retiring Officers," "The Officers of the Present Session," and "The Committee" were the other toasts; and the proceedings, which were of an interesting character, were protracted to a late hour.

Appointments, &c.

MR. GEORGE BAKER, solicitor, of Willenhall, has been elected Clerk to the new Willenhall and Bentley School Board. Mr. Baker was admitted a solicitor in 1871.

MR. FREDERIC BARLOW, solicitor, of Cambridge, has been re-elected Mayor of that Borough for the ensuing year. Mr. Barlow was admitted a solicitor in 1833, and is in partnership with Mr. Charles William Palmer and Mr. John Wright Neville. He is one of the coroners for the county, clerk to the Cambridge Improvement Commissioners, the county magistrates, and the Chesterton Board of Guardians, superintendent-registrar, and secretary to Addenbrooke's Hospital.

MR. EDWARD THOMAS BRYDGES, solicitor, has been elected Town Clerk of the newly incorporated Borough of Cheltenham. Mr. Brydges was admitted a solicitor in 1850, and is in partnership with Mr. William Henry Mellersh. He has been for several years clerk to the Cheltenham Improvement Commissioners and to the Burial Board, and the Trustees of the Cheltenham and Gloucester Turnpike Roads.

MR. GEORGE WOODBURY COCKRAM, solicitor, has been elected Mayor of the Borough of Tiverton for the third consecutive year. Mr. Cockram was admitted a solicitor in 1847, and is an alderman of Tiverton, vestry clerk, and clerk to the Tiverton School Board, Burial Board, and Charity Trustees.

MR. HENRY CORBETT, solicitor, has been re-appointed Under-Sheriff of the City and County of the City of Worcester for the ensuing year. Mr. Corbett was admitted a solicitor in 1873.

Mr. ALBERT VENN DICEY, barrister, has been appointed Junior Standing Counsel to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, in the place of Mr. Francis Ford Pinder, deceased. Mr. Dacey is the son of Mr. Thomas Edward Dacey, of Claybrook Hall, Leicestershire, and was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated first class in *Litteræ Humaniores* in 1858. In 1860, he obtained the Arnold Prize for an Essay on the Privy Council, and was elected to a fellowship at Trinity College. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1863, and is a member of the Northern Circuit. Mr. Dacey in 1872 and 1873 was appointed Lecturer on Common Law by the Incorporated Law Society.

Mr. THOMAS EDELSTAN, solicitor, of Preston, has been appointed Clerk to the Governors of the Penwortham Grammar School. Mr. Edelstan was admitted a solicitor in 1861.

Mr. CHARLES F. P. EDMUNDSON, solicitor, of Masham, has been elected Clerk to the Ripon Board of Guardians, in the place of Mr. William Edmund Metcalfe Winn, resigned. There were ten candidates for the appointment.

Mr. JAMES FALLON, barrister, has been appointed Deputy-Mayor of the newly incorporated Borough of Cheltenham for the ensuing year. Mr. Fallon was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in Hilary Term, 1849, and is a member of the Oxford Circuit, practising locally in Gloucestershire. He is also recorder of Tewkesbury.

Mr. JOSEPH HECTOR GARRICK, barrister, has been appointed Attorney-General of the Colony of Fiji, in succession to Mr. James Herman De Ricci, appointed Substitute-Procurer of the Mauritius. Mr. Garrick was called to the bar at Melbourne in 1869, and he has been for two years police magistrate for Fiji.

Sir WILLIAM HACKETT, Knight, has been appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Colony of Ceylon, in the place of Sir Edward Shepherd Creasy, resigned. Sir W. Hackett is the son of the late Mr. Bartholomew Hackett, of Cork, where he was born in 1824. He was educated at Stonyhurst, and at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1851. He formerly practised on the Northern Circuit, and he was appointed Queen's Advocate of the Gold Coast in 1861, Chief Justice in 1863, and Lieutenant-Governor of the colony in 1864. He was knighted by patent in 1866 on being appointed recorder of Prince of Wales's Island; and on the transfer of the Straits Settlements from the Indian Government to the Crown, he became judge of the Supreme Court of Penang. Sir W. Hackett acted in 1871 as Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements, and in April, 1875, he was appointed Chief Justice of the new colony of Fiji.

Mr. FREDERICK VIVIAN HILL, solicitor, has been re-elected Mayor of the Borough of Helston for the ensuing year. Mr. Hill was admitted a solicitor in 1853, and is clerk to the county magistrates, the Helston Board of Guardians, and the North Helston Highway Board. This is Mr. Hill's fourth year of office.

Mr. JOHN BLOSSETT MAULE, Q.C., has been appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Unreformed Municipal Corporations, in the place of the late Mr. Justice Archibald. Mr. Maule is the son of Mr. George Maule, barrister, many years Solicitor to the Treasury. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated third class in classics in 1838, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1847. He is a member of the Midland Circuit, and he became a Queen's Counsel in 1866. Mr. Maule is recorder of Leeds, and a bencher of the Inner Temple. He acted in 1865-6 as a member of the special commission to inquire into the causes of the outbreak in Jamaica.

Mr. JOSEPH FARMER MILNE, solicitor (of the firm of Hinde, Milne, & Sadlow), Manchester, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner to take Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Lancaster.

Mr. CHARLES GREVILLE PRIDEAUX, Q.C., F.R.A.S., has been appointed Recorder of Exeter, in succession to Mr. Justice Lopes. Mr. Prideaux was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated first class in mathematics in 1831. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn

in Easter Term, 1836, and practises on the Western Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1866, and recorder of Helston in the following year. Mr. Prideaux is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, and has acted as a commissioner for the trial of petitions under the Corrupt Practices (Municipal) Elections Act, 1872.

Mr. CHARLES ROBBINS (of the firm of Bolton, Robbins, & Busk), of 1, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women in and for the Cities of London and Westminster and the County of Middlesex.

Mr. ARTHUR SHIRLEY has been appointed Deputy-Coroner for the Borough of Doncaster.

Mr. WHITLEY STOKES, LL.D., barrister, who has been appointed Legal Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in succession to Mr. Arthur Hobhouse, Q.C., whose term of office has expired, is the son of Dr. William Stokes, Dublin, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he proceeded to the degree of LL.D. He was admitted a member of the Irish bar in 1853, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1855. Mr. Stokes formerly practised as an equity draftsman and conveyancer. He was appointed secretary to the Legislative Council of India several years ago, and in 1870 his appointment was raised to the status of a Government secretaryship, and he became secretary to the Legislative department of the Government of India.

Obituary.

MR. ROBERT ASCROFT.

Mr. Robert Ascroft, solicitor, of Preston, died at his residence, Gleadale, Langrange, on the 14th inst., at the age of seventy-one. Mr. Ascroft was the son of Mr. William Ascroft, of Preston, and was born in 1805. He was educated at the Carmel Grammar School, and was admitted a solicitor in 1827, having served his articles with Messrs. John & Thomas Howard, of Preston, where he was a fellow-clerk with the late Sir William Atherton. He at once commenced practice in the town, first in partnership with the late Mr. Southward, and next with his brother, Mr. William Ascroft. Latterly he was associated with his eldest son, Mr. William Ascroft, who was admitted in 1855, and with Mr. Alfred Edward Ascroft, who was admitted in 1871. The deceased was a commissioner for oaths in the High Court, and a perpetual commissioner for Lancashire, and his private practice was very extensive. Mr. Ascroft commenced his municipal career as a member of the old improvement commission and he was for five years one of the aldermen of Preston. In 1852 he was unanimously elected clerk to the local board of health and a few months later he became town clerk and clerk of the borough court of record. His public services were very valuable, and he identified himself with all movements for promoting the general welfare of the town. He was for several years secretary to the Preston Mechanics' Institute. His politics were Liberal, and he worked hard for his party in former years, though his official position afterwards reduced him to neutrality. In September, 1875, Mr. Ascroft was compelled, through failing health, to resign his appointments, and the town council passed a resolution regretting his retirement and testifying to his valuable services. He had, to a very great extent, relinquished business, and it was hoped that rest and leisure would have restored his health, but he had been for several months in a very precarious state. Mr. Ascroft was buried on Saturday, the 18th inst., at Penwortham Church.

MR. FRANCIS LEWIS BODENHAM.

Mr. Francis Lewis Bodenham, solicitor, died at Castle-street, Hereford, on the 11th inst., at the age of eighty-two. Mr. Bodenham was born at Kingston in 1794, and was admitted a solicitor in 1816, and practised in Hereford for over forty years. He was formerly in partnership with the late Mr. John James, on whose death he became head of the firm, and in 1857 he retired in favour of his nephew,

Mr. Frederick Bodenham, the present clerk of the peace for Hereford. He had been many years county treasurer for Herefordshire, which office he retained till the time of his death. Mr. Bodenham was for a long time associated with the municipal business of Hereford. He was for forty years an alderman, having been one of the first batch elected on the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act, and he was elected mayor of the city in 1840, and again in 1857. He was chairman of the City Charity Trustees, and a governor of the Hereford Infirmary. Mr. Bodenham warmly supported the Liberal party, but was greatly esteemed by all parties and all classes in the city. His death has caused universal sorrow. At a special meeting of the town council a vote expressive of regret at his death was proposed by the mayor, and carried unanimously. He was buried at the Hereford Cemetery on Wednesday, the 15th inst., the funeral being attended by the mayor and corporation, by Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., and by a large assemblage of friends and neighbours. Mr. Bodenham was unmarried.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION IN MARITIME CAUSES.

MR. E. E. WENDT, of 15, Fechurch-buildings, has sent us the following observations:—Towards the close of the last session of Parliament, the Legislature passed, in the 39 & 40 Vict. c. 59, an Act which, by effecting a radical change in the hearing of appeals in admiralty causes, affects the general maritime interests of this and many other countries most injuriously.

The change complained of is this: Hitherto, in causes brought before the admiralty tribunal in England, one appeal only has been thought necessary, and one appeal only has there been, but now by this Act it is enacted, for what reasons it is hard to say, that henceforward there shall be, in addition to the existing appeal, a second one, viz., to the House of Lords, quite unnecessary for the performance of justice in those causes, and unasked for by all those most interested in having justice performed therein.

Representing in this country the principal foreign underwriting bodies in the world, and perceiving at once how their interest would be prejudiced by this unfortunate innovation, I addressed a letter, on the 29th of August last, to the Lord Chancellor, calling the attention of his lordship to the following facts and reasons, to which it is now my wish to draw more general attention, namely—

That at no time, either when the appeals in maritime causes went in accordance with the Act 25 Hen. 8, c. 19, to the High Court of Delegates, or in accordance with the Act 2 & 3 Will. 4, c. 92, to his Majesty in Council, or in accordance with the Act 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 41, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, at no time when the final appeal lay to any one of these varied tribunals had it been considered or even suggested that a second appeal was necessary or even might be beneficial;

That the fact that this was the case until the passing of 36 & 37 Vict. c. 66, was a strong proof of the adequacy and efficiency of the single appeal in such causes, and the absence of any wish on the part of the suitors to have any second appeal;

That, as a matter of fact, the suitors in admiralty causes did not want any alteration in the procedure so far as concerns appeals therefrom, and were, on the contrary, much opposed to any second appeal;

That the very Act—the one already referred to—which first clearly throws this burden on the suitors in admiralty causes, excepts, in its 12th section, all causes in the courts of Ireland and Scotland from liability to review by the House of Lords which had not been liable to it before;

That it is, therefore, an act of great hardship on the part of the British Legislature to the suitors in admiralty causes in England to place them, not only in a worse position than they have been for centuries past, but also in a worse position than that so reserved to suitors in the courts of Ireland and Scotland;

That the foreign underwriters, whose representative I am were all most anxious, and that I was confident the maritime constitutions of this country were so also, to be freed from this most expensive, unnecessary, and cumbersome innovation;

And I, finally, prayed his lordship to consider the necessity

of obtaining the passing of an amendment Act to reinstate the procedure of admiralty causes on appeal into the same position as before the passing of 33 & 39 Vict. c. 77.

The answer I received to my communication was as follows:—

"5, Cromwell Houses, S.W., 7th September, 1876.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Lord Chancellor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ult. upon the subject of 'Appellate Jurisdiction in Maritime Causes.'

"I am, in reply, to inform you that the jurisdiction in admiralty having, by the Judicature Act of 1873, been made a part of the general jurisdiction of the High Court of Justice, the procedure of appeal is now the same in admiralty as in other causes.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "HENRY J. L. GRAHAM, Principal Secretary."

Now, it may be asserted that the right of appeal to the House of Lords is not a burden but a privilege. It may be so in some cases and to some extent; but it is a burden none the less still more frequently and to a much greater extent. The greatest privilege suitors can have is for their cases to be settled as justly as possible, but, above all things, with the least possible loss of time and money. Every extra and unnecessary appeal causes direct loss both of time and of money to the suitors, and is therefore a burden to them; and in this case, where the appeal under discussion is to the House of Lords, and therefore both costly and tedious, the burden is very heavy indeed.

It must be remembered that the tendency of recent legislation has been to limit the liability of shipowners; and the accretion of costs will not in any way increase the extent of the remedy to be obtained by litigation.

It is evident, therefore, that those who are obliged to become suitors in the Admiralty Division of the High Court of Justice of England have two serious grounds of complaint:

Firstly. That they have become burdened with the great expenses and delays of an unnecessary second appeal, to the House of Lords, although during the centuries in which they have had the one single appeal they have never desired, and they do not now desire, any second appeal.

Secondly. That they have been so burdened while such suitors as in the courts of Ireland and Scotland enjoyed the privilege of being exempt from the appeal to the House of Lords have continued to retain their privilege.

It is not maintained that any advantage accrues to any one by the creation of this grievance; but the only reason which is and can be assigned for it is the asserted desirability of a uniformity of practice between the Admiralty Division and the other divisions of the High Court of Justice.

It is for this utterly inadequate reason, then, that while every enlightened Government is doing its best to lessen the burdens which are the inseparable, or rather the natural consequences of commerce and trade, a burden so heavy is laid on two of the principal handmaids of commerce and trade—the shipping and the underwriting interests.

PRESENTATION OF A TESTIMONIAL AT THE JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

On Saturday afternoon, after the close of the offices, an interesting scene took place at the Judges' Chambers, when a handsome silver inkstand and an address were presented to Mr. J. E. Saunders, the chamber clerk of Sir George Bramwell. Mr. Saunders has been more than fifty years attached to judges at the chambers. His lordship had expressed his approbation of the movement, and declared that Mr. Saunders well deserved the testimonial. The address, which was prepared by a committee of managing law clerks, referred to the kindness, courtesy, and assistance extended to them as a body by Mr. Saunders, who had set an excellent example to the other clerks at the Judges' Chambers. In reply, Mr. Saunders expressed, in fitting terms, his appreciation of the testimonial, and mentioned that he had been clerk to Mr. Justice Holroyd, Mr. Justice Taunton (to whom an inkstand had been presented by the law clerks), Mr. Baron Parke (Lord Wensleydale), and Mr. Baron Bramwell. He had, he said, been twenty-one years with Mr. Baron Bramwell, than whom a kinder and better man never lived. The sentiment was loudly cheered by a numerous body of managing clerks who attended the presentation. The meeting was addressed by Mr. Giles, Mr. Parker, and other members of the committee. The inscription on the inkstand

was in the following terms:—"Presented to Mr. J. E. Saunders by the managing clerks attending the common law Judges' Chambers, as a mark of their esteem for his uniform kindness to them during the very many years he had been clerk to Barons Parke and Bramwell." The proceedings were closed with a vote of thanks to the committee.

ADVOCATES IN THE LEEDS COUNTY COURT.

ON Monday last, before Mr. Serjeant Tindal Atkinson, the judge, at the Leeds County Court, David Gibson, plumber and contractor, Little Woodhouse-street, Leeds, sued the Harrogate Gas Company (Limited) to recover £610s. for goods supplied. Mr. Hardwick appeared for the plaintiff. Mr. Benjamin Hall, the plaintiff's traveller, said that in accordance with an order given him by Mr. Wilkinson, secretary to the defendants, the plaintiff supplied them with nine dozen smoke consumers, the charge for which, including a packing case, was £6 10s. The company kept the goods for a month or six weeks, exhibiting them in their shop window, and then returned them to the plaintiff, with a letter stating that they were not according to order, and did not answer the purpose which it was said they would. Mr. Wilkinson, the defendant's secretary, was proceeding with the case for the defence, when his Honour said the secretary of a public company should not be substituted for an advocate in a court of justice; in fact, he could hardly be, in the proper sense of the term, the representative of the company. The word "representative" was very much abused, and it was perhaps necessary, in a case of that kind, to state that there should be some limit as to how far a secretary could, in a court of this kind, represent a public company. Mr. Ferns said that he had to thank his honour, on the part of the profession, for his intervention in what was a somewhat difficult question, especially as another class of advocates who appeared in court, to whom his honour's remarks might be extended, was rapidly on the increase. His Honour said that so long as he occupied the position of judge, he would endeavour to prevent any abuses of the kind referred to.

Courts.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Before FIELD, J., and a special jury at Westminster.)

Nov. 8, 18.—*Marsh and another v. Dunlop & Co., and Sir J. D. Astley, Bart.*

Practice—Ord. 16, r. 6—Joinder of defendants—Costs of successful defendant.

When, under ord. 16, r. 6, a plaintiff has joined two or more persons as defendants, he must pay the costs of any defendant against whom no case has been established, and who himself did nothing to make the plaintiff believe him to be liable.

In this case a question of some importance arose as to the principle upon which the court, in its discretion, will deal with the costs of a successful defendant in an action in which, the plaintiff being in doubt from which of two persons he is entitled to redress, sues both as defendants under ord. 16, r. 6.

The plaintiffs' cause of action against the defendants was that the defendants Dunlop & Co., either as principals or as agents of the defendant Astley, employed the plaintiffs for commission to find, and that the plaintiffs did find, a purchaser of a certain estate.

The plaintiffs claimed to recover the commission either from Dunlop & Co. or from Sir J. D. Astley, or damages from Dunlop & Co. for breach of warranty of authority.

The defendants joined in their defence, and amongst other defences denied that Dunlop & Co. were authorized as agents of Sir J. D. Astley to employ the plaintiffs.

In the course of the trial evidence was given on the part of the defendants that Dunlop & Co. were not authorized, and the plaintiffs did not further contend, that Dunlop & Co. had authority to bind the defendant Astley.

Cohen, Q.C., and Wood Hill, for the plaintiffs.

Staveley Hill, Q.C., and Petheram, for the defendants.

The jury found a verdict for the plaintiffs against the

defendants Dunlop & Co., and a verdict for the defendant Astley.

Counsel for the plaintiffs thereupon made a special application to the judge under ord. 55 to order that the costs of the defendant Astley should not follow the event, upon the grounds that the plaintiffs were induced to join him as a defendant by the representation of Dunlop & Co. that they were authorized as his agents to employ the plaintiffs; that the defendants had joined in their defence; that, except the denial of authority, the defendants had failed to establish the statements in their statement of defence; and that the plaintiffs had reasonable grounds for joining Sir J. D. Astley as defendant.

The learned judge took time to consider his decision, and on November 18, gave judgment as follows:—

FIELD, J.—I took time to consider the application which was made to me in this case, because I thought it right to lay down some principle for my own guidance in similar cases. I have come to the conclusion that I must refuse to make any order upon the application, and the costs of Sir J. D. Astley will therefore follow the event.

I think that in cases of this kind, where the plaintiffs cannot recover from all of the defendants, a successful defendant, who has not himself done anything to induce the plaintiffs to believe that he is liable, is entitled to his costs.

The plaintiffs certainly were in a difficulty, for, if they had brought their action against either Dunlop & Co. or Sir John Astley alone, they might have had a verdict against them; and I think that the plaintiffs acted quite properly in availing themselves of the power given by ord. 16, r. 6, and in joining the defendants.

It appears, however, from the correspondence that, although Messrs. Dunlop & Co., when they employed the plaintiffs, represented that they were instructed by Sir John Astley to offer the estate for sale, the solicitors of the defendants informed the plaintiffs, before the action was brought, that there was a special arrangement between the defendants, and that Messrs. Dunlop & Co. were not authorized as the agents of Sir J. Astley to employ the plaintiffs so as to render him liable to them, and I do not find that the plaintiffs were induced by anything that Sir John Astley did to believe that he was liable, or to join him as defendant.

I therefore do not make any order in the present case, but I do not say that if I thought the plaintiffs had been misled I should not have decided otherwise.

Charles Russell, Q.C., as *amicus curie*, then informed the court that in an action for breach of contract, in which a principal and agent were joined as defendants, and in which the jury found that the agent had authority, and he was, therefore, not liable, Mr. Justice Blackburn refused to make any order relieving the plaintiff from the payment of the agent's costs.

Law Students' Journal.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

HILARY EXAMINATION, 1877.

The attention of students is requested to the following rules:—

As an encouragement to students to study jurisprudence and Roman civil law, twelve studentships of one hundred guineas each shall be established, and divided equally into two classes; the first class of studentships to continue for two years, and to be open for competition to any student as to whom not more than four terms shall have elapsed since he kept his first term; and the second class to continue for one year only, and to be open for competition to any student, not then already entitled to a studentship, as to whom not less than four and not more than eight terms shall have elapsed since he kept his first term; two of each class of such studentships to be awarded by the council, on the recommendation of the committee, after every examination before Hilary and Trinity Terms respectively, to the two students of each set of competitors who shall have passed the best examination in both jurisprudence and Roman civil law. But the committee shall

not be obliged to recommend any studentship to be awarded, if the result of the examination be such as in their opinion not to justify such recommendation.

No student admitted after the 31st of December, 1872, shall receive from the council the certificate of fitness for call to the bar required by the four Inns of Court unless he shall have passed a satisfactory examination in the following subjects, viz., (1) Roman civil law; (2) the law of real and personal property; (3) common law; and (4) equity.

No student admitted after the 31st of December, 1872, shall be examined for call to the bar until he shall have kept nine terms; except that students admitted after that day shall have the option of passing the examination in Roman civil law at any time after having kept four terms.

An examination will be held in December and in January next, to which a student of any of the Inns of Court who is desirous of becoming a candidate for a studentship, or honours, or of obtaining a certificate of fitness for being called to the bar, or of passing the examination in Roman civil law only, will be admissible.

Each student proposing to submit himself for examination will be required to enter his name, personally or by letter, at the treasurer's or steward's office of the Inn of Court to which he belongs, on or before Wednesday, the 13th day of December next; and he will further be required to state in writing whether his object in offering himself for examination is to compete for a studentship, or honours, or of obtaining a certificate preliminary to a call to the bar, or whether he is merely desirous of passing the examination in Roman civil law under the above-stated rule.

The examination will take place in the hall of Lincoln's-inn; and the doors will be closed ten minutes after the time appointed for the commencement of the examination.

The examination by printed questions will be conducted in the following order:—

Friday and Saturday, the 29th and 30th of December next, at ten until one, and from two until five on each day, the examination of candidates for studentships in jurisprudence and Roman civil law.

The examination of candidates for honours and pass certificates, and for pass in Roman civil law only will take place as follows:—

Monday morning, 1st of January, at ten, on the law of real and personal property.

Tuesday morning, the 2nd of January, at ten, on equity.

Wednesday morning, the 3rd of January, at ten on Common Law.

Thursday morning, the 4th of January, at ten, on Jurisprudence and Roman Civil Law; in the afternoon, at two, on Constitutional Law and Legal History.

The Oral Examination will be conducted in the same order, and on the same subjects, as above appointed for the examination by printed questions.

Note.—Students admitted prior to the 1st of January, 1873, and who are candidates for a pass certificate only, have an option of passing in (1) constitutional law, and legal history, or roman civil law; (2) common law or equity; and (3) real and personal property law.

JURISPRUDENCE, CIVIL AND INTERNATIONAL LAW, AND ROMAN CIVIL LAW.

Candidates for the studentships will be examined in all the following subjects:—

I. Institutes of Gaius and Institutes of Justinian.

II. The titles of the Digest De Acquirendo rerum Dominio (XLI., 1) and De Acquirenda vel amittenda possessione (XLI., 2).

III. History of Roman law.

IV. Principles of jurisprudence, with special reference to the writings of Bentham, Austin, and Maine.

V. Elements of international law.

VI. Principles of private international law.

Candidates for honours will be examined in those numbered 1, 3, and 4; candidates for a pass certificate in the Institutes of Justinian.

The examiners in constitutional law and legal history will examine in the following books and subjects:—

1. Stubbs' Constitutional History of England.

2. Hallam's Constitutional History.

3. Broom's Constitutional Law.

4. The Principal State Trials of the Stuart Period.

5. The concluding chapter of Blackstone's Commentaries, being that "On the Progress of the Laws of England."

Candidates for honours will be examined in all the above-mentioned books and subjects; candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined in No. 1 and No. 3 only, or in No. 2 and No. 3 only, of the foregoing subjects, at their option.

The Examiner in Equity will examine in the following subjects:—

1. Trusts.

2. Administration of estates of deceased persons.

3. Partnership.

Candidates for honours will be examined in all the above-mentioned subjects. Candidates for a pass certificate only, in those numbered 1 and 2.

The Examiner in the Law of Real and Personal Property will examine in the following subjects:—

1. Estates, rights, and interests in real and personal property; and assurances and contracts concerning the same.

2. The feudal law, as adopted in England, independently of, and as affected by, statute; mortmain and testamentary disposition.

Candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined in the elements of the foregoing subjects; candidates for honours will have a higher examination.

The Examiner in Common Law will examine in the following subjects:—

1. Mercantile law.

2. The law relating to bills of exchange.

3. The law of evidence.

4. Criminal law.

Candidates for a pass certificate only will be examined on general and elementary principles of law; and from candidates for honours the examiner will require a more advanced knowledge of the application of those principles, and a knowledge of leading decisions.

By order of the Council,

(Signed) S. H. WALPOLE, Chairman.

Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn Hall, Nov. 14, 1878.

CALLS TO THE BAR.

The following gentlemen were, on Friday, the 17th inst., called to the bar:—

LINCOLN'S-INN.—Arthur Matheson Fraser, Esq., B.A. and LL.B. Cambridge, and of the University of London; Henry Philip Roche, Esq.; Frederic William Maidland, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Isaac Saunders Leadam, Esq., M.A. Oxford, Fellow of Brasenose College; Alexander Gordon, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Andrew John Leach, Esq., B.A. Oxford; Henry Alleyne Bovell, Esq., University of London; and Frederick Charles Aplin, Esq., B.A. Oxford.

INNER TEMPLE.—John Harvey Templer, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; John Bagnall Evans, Esq., M.A. Oxford; Walter W. Rouse Ball, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Samuel Evan Butler, Esq., M.A. Oxford; John Skirrow Follett, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Arthur Hammond Robin, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Henry W. Baden, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Hon. Mark Francis Napier, B.A. Cambridge; Ernest Mackean, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Philip Francis Walker, Esq.; Granville Geo. Miller, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Cuthbert John Ottaway, Esq., B.A. Oxford; Walter Shirley Shirley, Esq., B.A. Oxford; Charles Henry Lomax, Esq., B.A. Oxford; Thomas Marshall Todd, Esq., M.A. Oxford; James Parsons, Esq., B.A. Oxford; Henry Thomas Hyde, Esq., LL.B. Cambridge; Edward Bennett Calvert, Esq., B.A. Cambridge; Johannes Hornius Lange, Esq., LL.B. Cambridge; and William Wills, Esq., B.A. Cambridge.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—Louis Kosuth Laurie, Esq.; Nanda Lal Dey, Esq.; Francis William Bradney Dunne, Esq., of King's-inn, barrister-at-law, and of Trinity College, Dublin, B.A., LL.B.; Arthur Francis Leach, Esq., B.A., New College, Oxford, and Fellow of All Souls', Oxford; Granville George Greenwood, Esq., of Trinity College, B.A., Cambridge; Radhikaprada Ghosh, Esq.; Francis Taylor Pigott, Esq., B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge; Edwin Flynn, Esq.; William Tucker, Esq., B.A., Lincoln College, Oxford; Arthur Child, Esq.; Samuel Henry Day, Esq.; Walter Talbot Cairns, Esq.; Thomas Charles Hedderwick, Esq.,

M.A. Glasgow University; Joseph Edwin Crawford Munro, Esq., LL.B., Downing College, Cambridge, and of the Queen's University, Ireland, holder of a Studentship in Roman Law and Jurisprudence from the Council of Legal Education; and Samuel Smith-Dorsett, Esq., GRY'S INN.—John Joseph Francis, Esq., of the London University, and Edward Cant-Wall, Esq.

Court Papers.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

This court will not sit during the continuance of the Winter Circuits. One court will sit *in Banco* on Monday next, the 27th inst., for all the courts, and each succeeding Thursday and Monday for motions only.

THE DIVISIONAL COURT OF APPEAL.

This divisional court will not sit again until further notice.

WINTER ASSIZES.

The following list appears in the *Gazette*. It will be seen that the places and dates we gave last week were correct:—

Winter Assize County No. 1.—Thursday, November 23, at Manchester.

No. 2.—Monday, December 11, at Leeds.

No. 3 and City of Lincoln.—Thursday, November 23, at Lincoln.

No. 4.—Wednesday, November 23, at Derby.

No. 5.—Monday, December 4, at Warwick.

No. 6 and City of Norwich.—Wednesday, November 23, at Norwich.

No. 7 and City of Worcester.—Saturday, December 16, at Worcester.

No. 8.—Wednesday, November 23, at Stafford.

No. 9.—Friday, December 1, at Winchester.

No. 10 and City of Exeter.—Wednesday, December 13, at Exeter.

No. 11.—Saturday, December 2, at Chester.

No. 12.—Monday, December 11, at Swansea.

West Derby Division of Lancashire.—Wednesday, December 6, at Liverpool.

Durham.—Monday, November 27, at Durham.

Northumberland and Town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne Monday, December 4, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

November 24, 1876.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Fold.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock Caledonian	100	121
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	106
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	81½
Stock Great Northern	100	135
Stock Do., A Stock	100	142
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	106
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	136
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	118
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	114
Stock London and North-Western	100	125
Stock London and South-Western	100	73
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	107
Stock Metropolitan	100	48
Stock Do., District	100	134
Stock Midland	100	106½
Stock North British	100	157½
Stock North Eastern	100	137
Stock North London and South Western	100	67
Stock North Staffordshire	100	69
Stock South Devon	100	127
Stock South-Eastern	100	—

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 95½	Annuities, April, '85, 9½
Ditto for Account, Dec. 1, 95½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1866
Do. 2 per Cent. Reduced, 74½	Ex. Bills, £1000, 2½ per Cent. 2 pm
New 2 per Cent., 94½	Ditto, £1000, Do. 37 pm
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £1000, Do. 42½, 237 pm.
Do. 7½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, — per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ch. (Lack half-year), 297
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 107½	Ditto 4½ per Cent., May, '79, 85
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent. April, '84
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '89, 102½	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto, ditto, Certificate —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
Ditto Enhanced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 85	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
2nd Inf. Fr., 5 per Cent., Jan. '72	

The annual report of the Clerical, Medical, and General Life Assurance Society states that the ordinary income of the year, exclusive of an exceptional receipt of £1,112, amounted to £270,611, and the death claims declined to £133,848, leaving a surplus of receipts over expenditure larger than on any previous occasion. It amounted to £102,567, and raised the Assurance Fund to £2,118,457.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

HIGGINS—Nov. 15, at 103, Holland-road, Kensington, the wife of Clement Higgins, barrister-at-law, of a son.

DEATH.

MORTIMER—Nov. 18, at Iden Lodge, Redhill, Surrey, John Mortimer, of 17, Clifford's-inn, suddenly, of heart disease.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Alexandra Palace Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Nov 11, appointed Robert Fletcher, Ladbury, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Dec 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Friday, Jan 12, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Bodfari Hematite Iron Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 15, directed to be heard before the V.C. at St. George's Hall, Liverpool, on Nov 30. Mather, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioners.
Liverpool United Land and Building Company, Limited.—By an order made by the V.C. dated Nov 7, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Williams, Liverpool, solicitor for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1876.

Hutchinson, John, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Shipbuilder, Dec 20.
Hutchinson v Hutchinson, V.C. Hall. Kidson, Sunderland.
Mayhew, Augustus Septimus, Montpellier row, Twickenham, Gent.
Dec 11. Rowles v Mayhew, V.C. Malins. Compton, Great George st, Westminster.
Moge, John Jenner, Bristol. Dec 9. Saunders v Longman, V.C. Hall.
Brittan and Co, Bristol.
Westmorland, Lydia Colson, Gilton Rectory, Gainsbridge. Dec 21.
Barker v Kirtton, V.C. Hall. Brewer, Bedford row.

TUESDAY, NOV. 21, 1876.

Allchurch, Thomas, Stourbridge, Worcester. Dec 20. Allchurch v Allchurch, V.C. Bacon. Honor, Brierley hill.
Cottrill, Edwin, Upton-upon-Avon, Worcester. Dec 7. Loddard v Cottrill, V.C. Malins. Jones, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st.
Crane, Charles, Leighton rd, Keston town, Baiter. Jan 1. Crane v Crane, V.C. Hall. Fielder and Spenser, Godliman st, Doctors' commons.
Fitzgerald, Eleanor Ann, Burton st, Burton crescent. Jan 8. Adolph v Dehman, M.B.
Gray, Sarah, Highbury park north. Dec 14. Hill v Howe, V.C. James. Holcombe, Great James st, Bedford row.
Hand, the children of Mary, under the will of James Lower. Jan 11. Power v O'Neill, V.C. Malins.
Hewlett, George, Farnham, Hanps, Gent. Dec 12. Low v Gobie, V.C. Bacon. Gobie, Farnham.

Middleton, William Alexander, Southfields, Surrey, Colonel R.A., and
 Harriet Margaret Middleton, Hampton Court Palace. Dec 20.
 Kavanagh v Middleton, M.R. Bridges and Co, Red Lion sq
 Mitchell, Thomas Alexander, Charles st, Berkeley sq, Esq. M.P. Dec
 9. Mitchell v Moberley, V.C. Bacon. Masterman, New Broad st
 Palmer, Robert, Pensonby place, Millbank, Traveller. Dec 20. Palmer
 v Bailey, V.C. Malins. Deane, South sq, Gray's inn
 Palmer, William, America sq, Wine Merchant. Dec 9. Neal v Palmer,
 M.R. Davies, Moorgate st
 Southgate, William, Margaret st, Haggerstone, Gent. Dec 15. Taylor
 v Harding, M.R. Briggs, Lincoln's inn fields
 Tagus, The. Jan 31. Royal Mail Steam Packet Company v Javal
 Company, Limited, V.C. Hall
 Tremble, Loh, Thursday, Cumbe rland, Yeoman. Dec 15. Tremble v
 Tremble, V.C. Bacon. Norman, Carlisle
 Twigg, Harry, Chalk rd, Islington, Brush Maker. Jan 15. Furness v
 Davis. Brackenridge, Bartlett's buildings, Holborn circus

Creditors under 22 & 23 Viet. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, NOV. 14, 1876.

Acworth, George Brindley, Rochester, Kent. Dec 31. Parker and
 Clarke, St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Bailey, William, Canterbury rd, Kilburn, Gent. Dec 30. Surr and
 Co, Abchurch lane
 Barrell, Thomas, Keynasham, Somersetshire, Veterinary Surgeon. Dec
 15. Fox and Whitluch, Bristol
 Batters, Richard, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Yeoman. Dec 20. Buckley
 and Miller, Stalybridge
 Belgrove, Thomas, Great Brickhill, Buckingham. Farmer. Dec 22.
 Newton, Leighton Buzzard
 Betts, John, Leeds, Hatter. Jan 1. Cranswick, Leeds
 Brooks, Sarah Martha, Wilmington, Kent. Dec 30. Gibson, Dartford
 Carnaby, Emma, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Dec 30. Chartres and Youll,
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Cast, Henry, Lewisham, Kent, Wine Merchant. Dec 11. Parker and
 Son, Dewisham
 Cooper, William, Bristol, Surg con. Jan 1. Bowles, Bristol
 Crauford, Louisa Aubrey, Old Dover rd, Blackheath, Jan 11. Yander-
 com and Co, Bush lane
 Dean, Hannah, Pule Green, Halifax, York. Dec 24. Emmet and
 Emmet, Halifax
 Edgcombe, Nathaniel, Clifton, Bristol, Gent. Dec 30. Richardson
 and Davies, Bristol
 Fokett, Joseph, Abbott's Langley, Herts, Esq. Dec 12. Currie and
 Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Foster, Thomas, Outershaw, York, Gent. Nov 28. Hammond, West
 Burton, Bedale
 Fry, Robert, Tockington, Olveston, Gloucester, G. Dec 14
 Crossman and Lloyd, Thornbury
 Gibberne, George, Epsom, Surrey, Esq. Dec 31. Parker and Clarke,
 St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Haford, Charles, Howell, Northampton, Gent. Dec 11. Lamb, Ket-
 tering
 Hancock, James, Sheffield, Pocket Blade Forger. Dec 5. Ibbotson,
 Sheffield
 Jenkins, William Vaughan, Combe Grove, Somerset, Esq. March
 25. Burne and Rooke, Bath
 Jones, Annie, Haswall, Cheshire. Dec 9. Morecroft and Winstanley,
 Liverpool
 Keighley, James, Priest court, Foster lane, Staff Merchant. Dec 9.
 Plunkett, Gutter lane
 Marchant, Joseph, Maidstone, Gent, Wholesale Clothier. Dec 31.
 Stennings, Maidstone
 Moore, Joseph Cooper, Syston, Leicester, Esq. Feb 8. Billings,
 Leicester
 Reynolds, James Langdon, Augusta place, Landedowns rd, Clapham
 rd, Esq. Dec 21. Parker and Clarke, St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Richardson, Eliza, Churchill, Somerset. Dec 21. Woolfries, Banwell
 Sutton, Samuel, West Bromwich, Stafford, Gent. Dec 31. Caddicks,
 West Bromwich
 Taylor, Henry, Highbury, Brewer. Dec 27. Lake and Co, New sq,
 Lincoln's inn
 Walker, Ralph Thompson, Seaton Carew, Durham, Farmer. Jan 1.
 Belk, Harlepool
 Westby, Edmund, Portland place, Esq. April 30. Parker and Clarke,
 St Michael's alley, Cornhill
 Wolstenholme, William, Heeley, Sheffield, Gent. Dec 12. Ibbotson,
 Sheffield
 Wood, Ralph, Milton, Stafford, Farmer. Dec 11. Hollinhead,
 Tunstall

FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1876.

Barker, William, Ipswich, Suffolk, Gent. Jan 1. Rodwell, Ipswich
 Botting, James, Billingham, Sussex, Maltster. Dec 28. Daintrey,
 Peterworth
 Corbin, James, Hornsey rd, Holloway, Pork Butcher. Dec 21. Lydall,
 Blomfield st
 Crisp, Mary, Orford, Suffolk. May 16. Wood, Woodbridge
 Cricklow, William, Leek, Stafford, Gent. Feb 15. Reutern and Son,
 Leek
 Duff, Eleanor, St George's rd, Pimlico. Jan 1. Ellis and Ellis,
 Spring gardens
 Durham, Andrew, Bath, Somerset, Esq. Dec 25. Inman and Inman,
 Bath
 Durham, Andrew, Bath, Somerset, Esq. Dec 27. Meynell, Castle st,
 Holborn
 Fortescue, Henry, Oxted, Surrey, Esq. Jan 31. Fearless and Sons,
 East Grinstead
 Greenhow, Dorothy, Kendal, Westmorland. Dec 30. Swainson,
 Kendal
 Hagar, John, sen, Courseborne, Kent, Gent. Dec 1. Hinds, Goud-
 hurst

Hadden, Ann Elizabeth Dixon, Bromley, Kent. Jan 1. Streeter,
 Croydon
 Harris, Henry John, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. Dec 15. Satchell and
 Chapelle, Queen st, Cheapside
 Heginbottom, Edward, Liverpool, Chemist. Dec 10. Evans, Ashton-
 under-Lyne
 Heywood, James, Farnworth, Lancashire, Gent. Dec 6. Orton and
 Bryan, Manchester
 Hildyard, Robert Henry, Catherstone, Dorset, Esq. Jan 20.
 Norion and Co, Victoria st
 Hunt, John, Hamsey Green, Surrey, Farmer. Jan 1. Streeter,
 Croydon
 Ingram, Elizabeth, New cross rd. Dec 16. Bolton and Co, Elm court,
 Temple
 Jeffries, James, Crich, Derby, Stone Merchant. Jan 1. Robotham,
 Derby
 Laslett, Henry, Ramsgate, Kent, Auctioneer. Jan 1. Edwards and
 Son, Ramsgate
 Leedham, William, Highfield, Hants, Esq. Jan 31. Lindsay
 and Co, Basinghall st
 Leite, Mancel Pinto, Salters' Hall court. Jan 31. Croose, Lancaster
 place, Strand
 McGarel, Charles, Belgrave sq, Esq. Jan 1. Maples and Co, Fred-
 erick's place, Old Jewry
 Robertson, John, Princes st, Hanover sq, Tailor. Dec 31. Wheeler,
 Queen Victoria st
 Sant, John, Spondon, Derby, Gent. Dec 29. Robotham, Derby
 Sholl, Esther, Congrebury, Somerset. Nov 30. Thomson and Ward,
 Bedford row
 Smith, Branthwaite Hope, Turnham Green, Butcher. Dec 2. Wright,
 Crosby Hall chambers, Bishopsgate st
 Tate, Margaret, Liverpool. Dec 9. Williams, Lord st
 Thirby, George, Fleckney, Leicester, Farmer. Dec 28. Stevenson,
 Leicester
 Topham, Anne, Middleham, York. Dec 1. Hammond, Bedale
 Topham, Christopher, Middleham, York, Esq. Dec 1. Hammond,
 Bedale
 Wain, James, Belgrave, Leicester, Farmer. Dec 21. Stevenson,
 Leicester
 Waites, Peter, Ackworth, York, Cdrwainer. Jan 1. Foster and
 Richards, Pontefract
 Woolcombe, Thomas, Devonport, Devon, Esq. Dec 31. Woolcombe
 and Co, Devonport
 Worthington, Frances, Skirbeck, Lincoln. Dec 20. Hannynbun and
 Sons, Huntingdon
 Wright, Henry, Liverpool, Cabinet Maket. Dec 9. Tyrer and Co,
 Liverpool

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Baylis, Charles, Poultry, Solicitor. Pet Nov 14. Hazlitt. Nov 29 at
 11
 French, Thomas, Barnet grove, Bethnal green rd, Boot Manufacturer
 Pet Nov 16. Pepps. Dec 4 at 12
 Maidstone, Viscount, Victoria st, Westminster. Pet Nov 15. Pepps
 Nov 28 at 12
 Phillips, John, St Mary-at-Hill, Forwarding Agent. Pet Nov 15.
 Pepps. Nov 28 at 2
 Preston, Charles, East India avenue, Leadenhall st, Solicitor. Pet
 Nov 16. Pepps. Dec 6 at 12.30
 Robey, Henry, jun, Holloway rd, Grocer. Pet Nov 15. Pepps. Nov
 28 at 1

To Surrender in the Country.

Bowes, John Bealand, Bradford, Timber Merchant. Pet Nov 14.
 Robinson. Bradford, Dec 1 at 9
 Clayton, Thomas Waterhouse, Cornborough, York, Farmer. Pet Nov
 6. Woodall. Scarborough, Nov 29 at 2
 Deacon, Matthew, Brandon, Durham, Grocer. Pet Nov 13. Marshall.
 Durham. Nov 28 at 11
 Dromtra, Frederick William Constantine, Eastbourne, Commission
 Agent. Pet Nov 15. Blaker. Lewes, Dec 1 at 12
 Fuller, Charles, Askham-in-Furness, Grocer. Pet Nov 14. Postle-
 thwaite. Barrow-in-Furness, Dec 1 at 12
 Goodfellow, William Richard, Roobe, Cornwall, Surgeon. Pet Nov 14.
 Chilcott. Truro, Nov 29 at 10.30
 Gray, Philip Edward, Cambridge, Innkeeper. Pet Nov 15. Eaden.
 Cambridge, Nov 29 at 2
 Pechin, George, Cosby, Leicester, Wheelwright. Pet Nov 18. Ingram.
 Leicester, Nov 28 at 12
 Trueman, Alfred, Birmingham, Jeweller. Pet Nov 1. Parry. Bir-
 mingham, Nov 30 at 11

TUESDAY, NOV. 21, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Wright, A D, Union court, Old Broad st. Pet Nov 17. Keens.
 Dec 4 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Church, William, Nantwich, Cheshire, Silk Mercer. Pet Nov 15.
 Speckman. Crewe, Dec 7 at 3
 Cotterill, George Thomas, Milton-near-Gravesend, Waterman Fillet.
 Pet Nov 18. Hayward. Rochester, Dec 11 at 2
 Hinds, John, West Cross, nr Swansea, Coal Merchant. Pet Nov 16.
 Jones. Swansea, Dec 2 at 12

Horne, E.
 Luton,
 Jackson,
 Dec 4
 Jones, J.
 Pet N
 Morgan,
 Jones.
 Rigby, J.
 pool, J.
 Sreke, H.
 Exeter,
 Thorn, J.
 Stone,
 Babbage,
 Butcher,
 Barrow,
 offices,
 Barrow,
 of Esq,
 Benson,
 3 at
 Bingham,
 offices,
 Bradford,
 of Glou,
 Brown,
 offices,
 Barrow,
 29 at
 borough,
 Clark, J.
 and W,
 Clarkson,
 offices,
 Colley,
 of Fre,
 Cowham,
 11 at
 Crabtree,
 Neill,
 Crook,
 of Tes,
 Deakin,
 offices,
 Dews, F.
 at offi,
 Dicken,
 the L,
 Dyke, E.
 Beaton,
 Eaton,
 3 at
 Becho,
 Ederley,
 office,
 Foster,
 office,
 Gales,
 office,
 Greenw,
 Rawe,
 Griffin,
 Thom,
 Goodam,
 145,
 Gottlie,
 Oxford,
 Dromtra,
 office,
 Hale,
 Bang,
 Halliday,
 Manc,
 Harphs,
 at of,
 Harris,
 Fisher,
 Bank,
 Hough,
 of L,
 Hyde,
 Varn,
 Dilling,
 at offi,
 Jahnsw,
 Nov
 ches,
 Jones,
 Mari,
 Lashby,
 at 3
 Lawis,
 Dec
 Lord,
 of T,
 Manie,
 Good,
 Manni,
 office,

Horne, Frederick, Bedford, Bonnet Manufacturer. Pet Nov 16. Cooke.
Luton, Dec 3 at 12
Jackson, William, Walsall, Carpenter. Pet Nov 16. Clarke. Walsall.
Dec 4 at 12
Jones, Ernest, Bishopstoke, Hants, late an Officer in H.M.'s Army.
Pet Nov 15. Godwin. Winchester, Dec 4 at 11
Morgan, John, Penclawd, Glamorgan, Master Mariner. Pet July 10.
Jones. Swansea, Dec 3 at 11
Riely, James, Liverpool, Chemist. Pet Nov 17. Bellringer. Liver-
pool, Dec 4 at 3
Swete, Henry John Beaumont, Torquay, Gent. Pet Nov 16. Daw.
Exeter, Dec 7 at 10
Thorn, Richard, Plymouth, Draper. Pet Nov 16. Edmonds. East
Stonehouse, Dec 2 at 12

Liquidation by Arrangement.
FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.
FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1876.

Babbage, Samuel William, Canterbury cottages, Lower rd, Islington.
Butcher. Dec 1 at 2 at offices of Aitenborough, St Paul's churchyard
Bernard, Felix Lancelot Wade, Bristol, Accountant. Nov 28 at 2 at
offices of Fussell and Co, Corn st, Bristol
Barrow, Robert Williams, Bristol, Carpenter. Nov 25 at 11 at offices
of Esary, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
Benson, William Wilkinson, Newington, York, Tobaccoist. Nov 28 at 3
at offices of Brown, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Jackson
Bingham, George John, Droydsden, Lancashire, Dyer. Dec 1 at 3 at
offices of Law, King st, Manchester
Bradford, Henry, Cannock, Stafford, Builder. Nov 29 at 10 at offices
of Glover, Park st, Walsall
Brown, George John, Blackburn, Timber Merchant. Nov 30 at 2 at
offices of Hall, Victoria st, Market place, Blackburn
Barrow, Robert Harwood, Loughborough, Auctioneer. Nov 28
at 12 at the King's Head Hotel, Loughborough. Goode, Lough-
borough
Clark, Joseph, Leeds, Pawnbroker. Nov 29 at 12 at offices of Newstead
and Wilson, Red Hall, Leeds
Clarkson, Charles, Pendlebury, Lancashire, Grocer. Dec 4 at 3 at
offices of Horner, Clarence st, Manchester
Colley, Joseph, Burdett rd, Mile End, Butcher. Nov 30 at 3 at offices
of Freeman, Bedford row
Cowham, Joseph Henry, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 30 at
11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Oatbee, Mary, Bradford, China Dealer. Nov 30 at 3.30 at offices of
Bell, Kirkgate, Bradford
Creek, George, Margam, Glamorgan, Gardener. Dec 5 at 3 at offices
of Tennant and Jones Aberavon
Dakin, David Frowett, Birmingham, Lithographer. Nov 28 at 12 at
offices of Falwode, Cherry st, Birmingham
Dews, Philip, Horbury, York, Woollen Manufacturer. Nov 30 at 3
at offices of Burton, Wood st, Wakefield
Dickenson, Frederick, Selby, York, Common Brewer. Dec 1 at 12 at
the Londeborough Arms Hotel, Selby. Weddall and Parker, Selby
Dyke, James Henry, Birmingham, Jeweller. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of
Beaton, Temple row, Birmingham
Easton, George, Dunnish Booth Farm, Lancashire, Farmer. Nov 30 at 3
at the King's Arms Hotel, Yorkshire st, Oldham. Ashworth,
Rochdale
Edenham, Francis Clement, Swansea, Bookseller. Nov 27 at 3 at
offices of Smith and Co, Cambrian place, Swansea
Foster, William James, Woodford, Merchant's Clerk. Nov 30 at 10 at
offices of Fisher and Co, Leicester sq
Gale, William Henry, Emmett st, Poplar, Sailmaker. Dec 4 at 2 at
offices of Hilbery, Cretched Friars
Greenwood, Benjamin, Bradford, Woolstapler. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of
Rawson and Co, Piccadilly, Bradford
Griffin, Joseph, Birkenhead, Greengrocer. Nov 30 at 2 at offices of
Thompson and Stimm, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead
Goodman, Thomas, Landport, Hants, Bookseller. Nov 30 at 2.30 at
148, Chesapeake. King, Portsea
Gottife, Isaac, Leeds, Tailor. Nov 30 at 3 at offices of Billinton,
Oxford row, Leeds
Gundry, Edward, Southampton, out of business. Nov 30 at 2 at
offices of Kilby, Portland st, Southampton
Hale, David, Alna rd, Bermondsey, Carman. Nov 25 at 3 at 10,
Banger terrace, Langdale rd, Peckham
Halliday, John, Scarborough, General Dealer. Nov 27 at 10 at 89,
Manor row, Bradford
Marham, John Thomas, Malin bridge, York, Saddler. Nov 30 at 11
at offices of Binney and Sons, Queen st chambers, Sheffield
Harris, Daniel, Swansea, Builder. Nov 30 at 12 at offices of Leyson,
Fisher st, Swansea. Charles, Neath
Hoggart, Luke, Leeds, Boiler Maker. Nov 28 at 3 at offices of Pullan,
Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
Hough, George, Lee, Kent, Marine Surveyer. Dec 4 at 2 at offices
of Lovison and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st
Hyde, John Peter, Liverpool, Grocer. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of Ponton,
Vernon st, Liverpool
Hingworth, Walter, Hightown, York, Rag Merchant. Dec 8 at 3
at offices of Schofield and Taylor, Brunswick st, Batley
Jherwood, Samuel, Southport, Lancashire, Lodging House Keeper.
Nov 30 at 3 at offices of Barling, Town Hall buildings, King st, Man-
chester
Jones, John, Jun, Fardre, Carnarvon, Cattle Dealer. Dec 3 at 2 at 6,
Market st, Carnarvon. Picton and Co, Pwllheli
Lashford, James Thomas, Stourbridge, Worcester, Butcher. Nov 27
at 3 at offices of Collis, Market st, Stourbridge
Lewis, William, Tanhouse Farm, St Margaret's, Hereford, Farmer.
Dec 7 at 12 at offices of Page, Chancery lane, Hay
Lord, James, Accrington, Lancashire, Flagger. Nov 29 at 11 at offices
of Tattersall, Richmond terrace, Blackburn
Manley, Joseph, Netheraux Farm, Devon, Farmer. Nov 30 at 1 at
Godfrey's Hotel, Tiverton Junction. Read and Cook, Bridgewater
Manning, Thomas, Liverpool, Commission Agent. Dec 2 at 11 at
offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool

Marsden, John, Barugh, York, Farmer. Nov 28 at 12 at the Coach and
Horses Hotel, Barnsley. Lake, Wakefield
Marsh, Thomas, South st, York, Provision Dealer. Dec 4 at 12 at
offices of Tompson, High st, Stockton. Trotter, Stockton-on-Tees
Newbound, William, Leeds, Bill Broker. Nov 29 at 2 at offices of Bond
and Barwick, Albion place, Leeds
Packer, Samuel Gilbert, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Dec 1 at 2
at the George Hotel, Nottingham. Wells and Hind, Nottingham
Pattison, Robert, and David Pattison, Middlesborough, Drapers. Nov
30 at 2 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zealand rd, Middlesborough
Pearson, William, Mexborough, York, Builder. Nov 29 at 3 at offices
of Clegg and Sons, Bank st, Sheffield
Perrett, William, Mersford st, Dairyman. Nov 24 at 4 at offices of
Yorke, Marylebone rd
Phillips, Frederick Henry, Knaphill, Surrey, Schoolmaster. Dec 2 at
2.30 at the White Lion Hotel, Guildford
Philp, Edward, Beverley, York, Pensioner. Nov 24 at 2 at offices of
Clarke, Chancery buildings, Hull
Pilling, William, Bolton, Millwright. Nov 30 at 3 at offices of Scow-
croft, Town Hall sq, Bolton
Piper, Edward, Manchester, Draper. Dec 4 at 3 at the Black Swan
Hotel. Bailey and White, Winchester
Rose, Henry, Camberwell rd, Tailor. Dec 11 at 2 at the City Terminus
Hotel, Cannon st. Williams, Salters' Hall court
Rothwell, Edward, Bradford, Stampmaker. Nov 29 at 12 at the Dog
and Partridge Hotel, Old Corn Market, Manchester. Neill, Brad-
ford
Rusby, Samuel, Leeds, Tailor. Dec 1 at 2 at offices of Bond and Bar-
wick, Albion place, Leeds
Russell, Robert, Shepperton rd, Islington, out of business. Dec 7 at 3
at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton
Siddons, Joseph, Spalding, Lincoln, Earthenware Dealer. Nov 30 at 1
at the White Hart Hotel, Spalding. Cammack, Spalding
Suggett, James, Lofthouse-in-Cleveland, York, Draper. Nov 27 at 2.30
at offices of Addenbrooke, Zealand rd, Middlesborough
Terry, Rose, Rrompton rd, Milliner. Nov 30 at 2 at offices of Dalton,
and Jessett, St Clement's House, Clement's lane, Lombard st
Timmins, James Charles, Vassall rd, Brixton, Surveyor. Dec 11 at 2 at
offices of Colburn, Leadenhall st
Tippetts, Spencer Cooke, Aston, Warwick, out of business. Dec 7 at
3 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury
Tisdall, Sarah Ann, Ranelagh rd, Pimlico, General Shopkeeper. Nov
27 at 3 at offices of Goatly, Cambridge terrace, Hyde park
Todd, James, South Shields, Builder. Dec 9 at 12 at offices of Dale,
King st, South Shields
Trotter, William, Liverpool, Ladies' Outfitter. Nov 30 at 3 at offices
of Rodgers, Lord st, Liverpool. Barrell and Rodway, Liverpool
Tuck, William Henry, Regent st, Portrait Painter. Nov 30 at 3 at
the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery lane. Daviest
Furnival's inn
Vyas, William, Beccles, Suffolk, Bootmaker. Dec 1 at 2 at offices of
Wiltshire, Hall plain, Great Yarmouth
Wagner, John Henry, Virginia row, Bethnal green, Baker. Dec 7 at
2 at offices of Brown, Basinghall st
Walch, William, sen, Meborough, York, Chemical Manufacturer.
Nov 29 at 3 at offices of Hoyland, Wellgate, Rotham
Weatherley, Susan, Park st, Grosvenor sq, Court Milliner. Dec 4 at 4
at 87, Park st, Grosvenor sq. Birchall, Gracechurch st
Webb, George, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. Dec 4 at 12 at
offices of Hansman, St Giles's st, Northampton
Welch, Matthew Joseph, Southport, Lancashire, no occupation. Dec
1 at 2 at offices of Cross and Co, London st, Southport
White, Edmund Henry, and Henry Alex and White, Pentonville rd,
Builders. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Knox, Newgate st
Whitehouse, James, Hawkesley, Worcester, Corn Dealer. Nov 29 at 3
at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
Williams, David, West Bromwich, Stafford, Beer Retailer. Dec 1 at
10.15 at offices of Jackson, Lombard st, West Bromwich
Williamson, Archibald, Bolton, Watchmaker. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of
Scowcroft, Town Hall sq, Bolton
Wilson, Charles, Lofthouse-in-Cleveland, York, Auctioneer. Dec 1 at
2.30 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zealand rd, Middlesborough
Wolstenholme, John, Radcliffe, Lancashire, Engineer. Dec 4 at 3 at
offices of Sutton and Elliott, Fountain st, Manchester
Young, Henry William, Bishop's Stortford, Stone Mason. Nov 25 at 4
at offices of Baker, Bishop's Stortford
Young, Joseph, Bolton, Restaurant Keeper. Nov 29 at 3 at offices of
Scowcroft, Town Hall sq, Bolton
Young, William Frowd, Salisbury, Chemist. Nov 29 at 11 at offices of
Cobb and Smith, The Canal, Salisbury

THURSDAY, NOV. 21, 1876.

Altman, Lewis Joseph, and Harris Brown, Monkwell st, Glass Im-
porters. Dec 7 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane
Allen, Henry, Tunbridge Wells, Journeyman Carpenter. Dec 2 at 2
at the Rose and Crown Hotel, Grosvenor rd, Tunbridge Wells. Harris,
Southwark st
Allen, John, and Allan Rowbotham, Manchester, Coal Merchants.
Dec 1 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Mar-
low, Manchester
Anderson, William, Liverpool, Currier. Dec 9 at 11 at offices of Lowe,
Castle st, Liverpool
Atkinson, Holdby, Huddersfield, Clothier. Dec 2 at 11 at offices of
Bottomley, New st, Huddersfield
Austin, Thomas, Reddish, Worcester, Draper. Dec 4 at 11 at offices
of Richards, William st, Redditch
Austin, William, Windmill st, Tottenham court rd, Carpenter. Nov 30
at 10 at 152, Westminster bridge rd. Goatly, Bow st, Covent
gardes
Baker, Richard William, Ingram rd, Falcon rd, Clapham Junction
Dec 4 at 3 at offices of Smith, King st, Chapside
Barker, Henry, Peabmarsh, Essex, Miller. Dec 6 at 11 at offices of
Cardinal, Halesditch
Bean, Edward, New North rd, Stationer. Dec 3 at 3 at the Guildhall
Coffee House, Grosvenor st. Davies and Co, Moorgate st
Beardmore, Enoch, Wolverhampton, Grocer. Dec 3 at 10.30 at offices
of Willecock, Queen's chambers, North st, Wolverhampton

- Deran, Richard, Pontardulais, Glamorgan, Ironfounder. Dec 1 at 3 at
 offices of Barnard and Co, Temple st, Swansea. Brown and Collins
 Blackburn, James, Clitheroe, Lancashire, Carter. Dec 2 at 11 at offices
 of Eastham, Church st, Clitheroe
 Bothroyd, James, Ferryhill, Durham, Grocer. Dec 4 at 11 at offices
 of Marshall and Oliver, Claypath, Durham
 Booghey, George, Stoke-upon-Trent, Eating Housekeeper. Dec 5 at
 11 at offices of Smith, Lead lane, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bowen, John Hagbin, Prince of Wales rd, Keston town, Chemist.
 Nov 25 at 11 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall
 st, Gregory, Barbican
 Bowstead, John Francis, Birmingham, out of business. Dec 6 at 3 at
 offices of Ansell, Temple st, Birmingham
 Brady, Alfred, Kingston-upon-Hull, Coal Merchant. Dec 4 at 11 at
 offices of Hearfield, Old Exchange buildings, Lowgate, Kingston-
 upon-Hull
 Brynshaw, Henry, Kirby Lonsdale, Westmorland, Joiner. Dec 7 at
 12 at offices of Picard, Kirby Lonsdale
 Burnley, William Henry, Darton, York, Coal Merchant. Dec 4 at 11
 at offices of Marshall and Owsenworth, Church st, Baresley
 Burrell, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Commission Agent. Nov 29 1,
 3 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Butler, Thomas, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Coach Builder. Dec 1 at 3
 at offices of Preen, Regent st, Cheltenham
 Chambers, Robert, St Mary Church, out of business. Dec 2 at 2 at
 the Union Hotel, St Mary Church rd, St Mary Church. Flound,
 Exeter
 Clark, George Wilkins, Healey-on-Thames, Engineer. Dec 4 at 12 at
 the Duke of Edinburgh Hotel, Reading
 Coleman, William, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Dec 4 at 4
 at offices of Warrington, Castle st, Dudley
 Copper, William, Manchester, Fruit Salesman. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of
 Sampson, South King st, Manchester
 Cordwell, Daniel, Cradley Heath, Stafford, Draper. Dec 6 at 2 at offices
 of Howell, High st, Brierley hill
 Curtis, Charles Edward, High st, Homerton, Farrier. Dec 9 at 11 at
 offices of Hicks, Globe rd, Mile End
 Davies, Edward William, Denbigh, Gent. Nov 25 at the Cliftonville
 Hotel, Margate, in lieu of the place originally named
 Davies, William, jun, Tynnyrwira, Montgomery, Farmer. Dec 4 at 12.15
 at offices of Williams and Co, The Bank, Newtown
 Dyson, John, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler. Dec 2 at 11 at offices of
 Leggo, George st, Sheffield. Exam, Sheffield
 Ellis, Charles, Sheffield, Draper. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Crowther and
 Co, Bath chambers, York st, Manchester. Porrett, Sheffield
 Ellis, Owen Richard, Holyhead, Schoolmaster. Dec 12 at 12 at the
 Liverpool Arms Hotel, Holyhead. Barber, Holyhead
 Fisher, Joseph, Preston, Grocer. Dec 5 at 3 at offices of Forshaw,
 Cannon st, Preston
 Francis, William, Honey lane market, Commission Agent. Dec 6 at 12
 at offices of Swaine, Cheapside
 Furiongo, Edward, Holywell, Flint, Shopkeeper. Dec 6 at 1 at the
 Queen Commercial Hotel, Chester. Davies, Holywell
 Gardner, James William, Southsea, Hants, Plumber. Dec 5 at 2.30 at
 145, Cheapside. King, Portsea
 Girardon, Charles, and Arthur Emile Wandrille, Birmingham, Lamp-
 makers. Dec 5 at 2 at offices of Woodward, Newhall st, Birming-
 ham
 Godwin, Fisher Gettiffe, Sheffield, Seedsman. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of
 Parker and Brailsford, Talbot chambers, North Church st, Sheffield
 Gould, Hersey, Queensborough, Kent, Coal Merchant. Dec 5 at 11 at
 offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne
 Green, Thomas, High rd, Upper Clapton, Builder. Dec 5 at 2 at offices
 of Angell and Imbert-Terry, Gresham st
 Handford, John, Hyde, Cheshire, Grocer. Dec 12 at 3 at offices of
 Grundy and Kershaw, Booth st, Manchester
 Hanson, William, Church terrace, Battersea, out of business. Dec 2
 at 11 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue. King, Fish
 st Hill
 Hartley, Sarah Ann, Joseph Harrison Hartley, and William Henry
 Verity, Leeds, Milliners. Dec 4 at 3 at offices of Joselyne and Co,
 King st, Cheapside. Rider
 Happle, John, North Shields, Builder. Dec 6 at 3 at offices of Bell,
 King st, South Shields
 Hill, William John, Middlesborough, Outfitter. Nov 27 at 3 at offices,
 of Gibson, Commercial buildings, Wilson st, Middlesborough. Teale
 Middlesborough
 Hogarth, John, Eaglesfield, Brigham, Cumberland, Farmer. Dec 5 at
 11 at offices of Wicks and Barr, Castlegate, Cookernouth
 Holmes, James, Ferry vale, Forest hill, Ironmonger. Dec 2 at 12 at
 145, Cheapside. Duncan, Gracechurch st
 Holmes, William, Newton Lane End, York, out of business. Dec 4 at
 11 at offices of Lake, Southgate, Wakefield
 How, Dixon, Commercial rd east, Ironmonger. Dec 15 at 3 at offices
 of Robinson, Coleman st, Lumley and Lumley, Old Jewry
 chambers
 Hughes, Elizabeth, Llancermymedd, Anglesey, Coal Dealer. Dec 5 at
 2 at the British Hotel, Bangor. Roberts, Llanelni
 Hurlin, Dan, Harrigate, York, China Dealer. Dec 4 at 4.30 at offices
 of Orlich, Princess st, Harrigate. Ford and Son
 Jenkinson, Thomas, Croydon, Paper Dealer. Dec 5 at 4 at offices of
 Watson, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
 Jervis, William, Cwmrhos, Tredegar, Mon., Coal Contractor. Dec 5
 at 3 at offices of Harris, Morgan st, Tredegar
 Johns, John Thomas, Elland rd, Lavender hill, Wandsworth, Tailor.
 Dec 12 at 2 at 37, Bedford row. Marshall
 Johnson, James, Darlington, Stafford, Timber Merchant. Dec 1 at 2 at
 offices of Corner and Fowler, Darlington st, Wolverhampton
 Johnson, Samuel, and James Johnson, Dudley, Worcester, Vice Manu-
 facturers. Dec 3 at 12 at offices of Warrington, Castle st, Dudley
 Jones, John, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Grocer. Dec 9 at 12 at offices of
 Roose and Price, North John st, Liverpool
 Jones, William, Birmingham, Baker. Nov 25 at 10.15 at offices of East,
 Eldon chambers, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Kealey, John, South Shields, Durham, Fruiterer. Dec 4 at 3 at offices
 of Bell, King st, South Shields
 Lovelock, Edward Charles, Warrage, Berks, no occupation. Nov 29
 at 4 at 50, Compton st, Regent sq
- Lovell, George, Old st, Shoreditch, Publican. Dec 7 at 4 at offices of
 Webb, Austin friars
 Lowies, William Westoby, Stoke Newington rd, Grocer. Dec 7 at 3 at
 the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Piesse and Son, Old Jewry
 chambers
 Lee, Joseph William, Cambridge, Engineer. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of
 Davies, St Andrew's st, Cambridge
 Lezian, William, Leicester, Courthouse Keeper. Dec 11 at 3 at offices
 of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester
 Leitcher, John Jameson, Cinderford, Gloucester, Writing Clerk. Nov
 30 at 3.30 at the Lion Hotel, Cinderford. Jackson, Strand
 Lotts, Thomas Alton, Crown buildings, Queen Victoria st, Map Seller.
 Nov 30 at 2 at 4, Arthur st east, London bridge. Carter and Bell,
 Eastcheap
 Macdiarmid, Angus Stewart, Wool Exchange, Coleman st, Wool Mer-
 chant. Dec 12 at 2 at offices of Allin and Greenop, St Peter's alley,
 Cornhill
 Miell, James Wesley, Chippenham, Wilts, Photographer. Dec 4 at 10
 at offices of Pinner and Co, Chippenham
 Miller, James Robert, Earlswood, Surrey, no occupation. Nov 29 at 3
 at offices of Howell, Queen Victoria st
 Mitchell, Henry, Crewe, Cheshire, Fruit Dealer. Nov 30 at 10 at
 offices of Pounton, Market st, Crewe
 Morrow, Nicholas, Darlington, Durham, Potato Merchant. Dec 4 at 3
 at offices of Barron, High row, Darlington
 Morris, John, Castlemorton, Worcester, Fruit Dealer. Dec 2 at 11 at
 offices of Tree, Avenue, Croes, Worcester
 Mesley, William, Barnham st, Tooley st, Carman. Nov 30 at 3 at
 offices of Walter and Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq
 Mouncer, Benjamin, Norwich, Bootmaker. Nov 30 at 11 at offices of
 Irons, Red Lion st, Norwich
 Newton, William, Kingston Magna, Dorset, Butcher. Dec 4 at 4 at
 the South-Western Hotel, Gillingham. Davies, Sherborne
 Nutley, James, Fimble rd, Chelsea, General Dealer. Nov 30 at 3 at the
 Back's Head, Chilton st, Bethnal green rd. Alby, Hill st, Walworth
 Oates, Joseph, Leeds, Grocer. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Hardwick,
 Infirmary st, Leeds
 Peider, George Henry, Liverpool, Coach Builder. Dec 4 at 2 at offices
 of Sheen and Broadhurst, North John st, Liverpool. Lawrence and
 Lixen, Liverpool
 Potts, Henry, Manchester, out of business. Dec 4 at 4 at offices of
 Best, Lower King st, Manchester
 Read, Henry, Leather lane, Livery Stable Keeper. Dec 4 at 12 at
 offices of Brunsell, Great James st, Bedford row
 Rees, John, Ferndale, Llanwanno, Glamorgan, Carpenter. Dec 6 at 3
 at 6, Church st, Pontypridd. Thomas
 Rees, Richard, Tredegar, Mon., Grocer. Dec 4 at 12 at offices of
 Cellians, Jun, Broad st, Bristol. Harris, Tredegar
 Rudbeck, William, Darlington, Durham, Tobacconist. Dec 6 at 2 at
 the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Barron, Darlington
 Sayer, John, Birmingham, Merchant. Dec 1 at 3 at offices of Fitter,
 Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Scalls, Charles, Morton-on-Swale, York, Wheelwright. Dec 1 at 12
 at the Durham Ox Hotel, Northallerton. James, York
 Schreiber, Felix August, Thavies inn, Manufacturer. Dec 7 at 2 at
 offices of Buffen, Wool Exchange. Dubois, King st, Cheapside
 Scott, William Robert, Darlington, Durham, Tobacconist. Nov 29 at
 11 at offices of Robinson, Handgate, Darlington
 Shattock, Alfred Henry, Bristol, Currier. Dec 4 at 2 at offices of
 Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
 Shelton, William, Jun, Nottingham, no occupation. Dec 7 at 12 at
 offices of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
 Shorts, Charles, Stratton, Dorset, Miller. Dec 6 at 11 at the Antelope
 Hotel, Dorchester. Howar, Melcombe Regis
 Soffell, Thomas William, Berkley st, Rotherhithe, Cooper. Nov 29 at 2
 at offices of James, Ludgate hill. Morris, Paternoster row
 Starkey, Charles, Nottingham, Journeyman Painter. Dec 5 at 12 at
 offices of Cockayne, Fletcher gate, Nottingham
 Stur, Thomas, Sheld, Confectioner. Dec 5 at 11 at offices of
 Forat, Queen st, Sheffield
 Tayor, Elijah, Ramsey, Huntingdon, Potato Dealer. Dec 6 at 4 at
 offices of Sergeant and Son, Ramsey
 Taylor, Herbert George Harrison, Seacroft, nr Leeds, Cowkeeper. Dec
 4 at 2 at offices of Bond and Barwick, Albion place, Leeds
 Thackway, Ralph, Winkley, York, Innkeeper. Dec 5 at 11.30 at the
 Black Swan Hotel, Westgate, Ripon. Wainell
 Wakefield, Charles William, Eastcheap Turville, Gloucester, Farmer.
 Dec 5 at 12 at the Wheat Sheaf Inn, Northleach. Brydges and
 Mellich, Cheltenham
 Weston, Edward, Luton, Straw-Hat Manufacturer. Nov 30 at 11 at
 offices of Neve, Park st west, Luton
 Whatmough, Thomas, Island House chambers, Swansea, Agent. Dec
 1 at 11 at offices of John, Mount st, Swansea
 Willson, Caleb Morris, Grosvenor terrace, Grosvenor rise, Waltham-
 stow, Barter's Clerk. Dec 7 at 2 at offices of Slater and Pansell,
 Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st. Pittman, Guildhall chambers
 Wood, Joseph Heawood, Southport, Lancashire, Mechanical Engineer.
 Dec 14 at 3 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Fountain st, Manchester
 Tollyall, Thomas, 18/10e-upon-Trent, Builder. Nov 29 at 12 at the
 Copeland Arms Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent. Bagnall, Stoke-upon-Trent

PARLIAMENTARY NOTICES, &c.—HARRISON

& Sons, Printers and Publishers of "THE LONDON GAZETTE,"
 undertake the insertion of Parliamentary Notices, and Legal
 and General Advertisements in "The London Gazette," and all Metro-
 politan, Provincial, and Foreign Journals.
 Files of the London, Dublin, and Edinburgh Gazettes kept for in-
 spection. Gazette Stamps can be procured, and all necessary infor-
 mation obtained at the publishing offices, 45, St. Martin's-lane.

**HARRISON & SONS, Publishers of "The London
 Gazette,"** employing sets of Night and Day Workmen,
 have special facilities for executing the printing of Bills, Notices,
 Books of Reference, Briefs, &c., &c., on their premises, 45 and 46,
 St. Martin's-lane, W.C.

